E
202
.4
.A34

REPORT OF

General Society

Sons of the Revolution.

1897.

Class E 202
.4
Book .A34

PRESENTED BY

MINUTES

OF THE

PROCEEDINGS

OF MEETING OF

THE GENERAL SOCIETY

HELD

OCTOBER 12TH, 1897,

AT

CINCINNATI, OHIO.

E202
.4
.A34

JOHN MURPHY & CO., PRINTERS,
BALTIMORE.

Gift
N.Y. Society
8 Ja '06

COPY OF RESOLUTION

OF

GENERAL SOCIETY UNDER WHICH THESE PROCEEDINGS ARE PRINTED.

"MR. LYON (Illinois): I move that the minutes of this special meeting be printed at length and an official copy be sent to the General Secretary of each of the State Societies.

"Seconded, put to vote and carried."

Minutes, p. 89.

GENERAL SOCIETY,

SONS OF THE REVOLUTION.

MEETING HELD AT

CINCINNATI, OHIO.

TUESDAY, *October 12th*, 1897.

Present:

President-General Hon. JOHN LEE CARROLL, in the Chair.
JAMES MORTIMER MONTGOMERY, Secretary-General.
W. HALL HARRIS, Assistant Secretary-General.

And the other officers and delegates appearing by roll-call, page 6 to 10.

THE PRESIDENT-GENERAL: Gentlemen, the Society will come to order. This meeting will be opened by prayer, by the Rev. Dr. Rhodes.

DR. DUDLEY WARD RHODES (Minnesota): Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we pray that Thy Spirit preside over our councils, and that Thou, who blessed the apostles, be present with us, who are here assembled. Guide our deliberations, so that we may exercise a wise spirit, and save us from all ignorance, error, and pride, and by thy favor enlighten our minds and strengthen our purpose, deepen our patriotic impulses, and draw us together in the cords of Thy love. Inspire us with a sense of Thy holy wisdom, and lead us to a wiser estimation of our fellow men. May there grow up in all our hearts, and the hearts of the general public about us, a deeper respect for our country, for its laws, and

for its polity, for its broad and generous citizenship. Inspire us with a sense of the responsibilities which our fathers have given to us. Quicken us in the right. Lead us to do Thy divine purpose, and through Thy holy guidance bring us at last into the great union of Thine elect where all the world's battles are past, and we shall enjoy rest and peace with Thee in Thy everlasting kingdom, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE CHAIR: The Secretary will now read to you the resolution under which this adjourned meeting from the Philadelphia meeting has been called.

Mr. Harris read the call, as follows:

"General Society, Office of General Secretary, No. 146 Broadway, New York, September 19th, 1897. Dear Sir: Pursuant to resolutions passed at its meeting held April 19th, 1897 (copies of which are attached to this notice), a meeting of the General Society, Sons of the Revolution, will be held at the Grand Hotel, in the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, at eleven o'clock A. M., on Tuesday, October the twelfth, 1897, for the purposes set out in said resolutions. You are requested to mail the enclosed postal cards, stating whether you do or do not propose to be present, on or before October 6th proximo. Yours truly, James Mortimer Montgomery, General Secretary."

MR. HARRIS: Is it desired, sir, that the resolution shall be read?

THE CHAIR: I think unless it is suggested that the resolution be read that it might as well be omitted.

THE CHAIR: Better call the roll now, Mr. Secretary.

The call of the roll showed the following officers and delegates present:

General Officers.

HON. JOHN LEE CARROLL,
General President.

GARRET DORSET WALL VROOM,
General Vice-President.

James Mortimer Montgomery,
General Secretary.

William Hall Harris,
Assistant General Secretary.

Richard McCall Cadwalader,
General Treasurer.

Henry Cadle,
Assistant General Treasurer.

Francis Ellingwood Abbot,
General Registrar.

Gaillard Hunt,
General Historian.

Alabama.

Not represented.

California.

James Mortimer Montgomery.

Colorado.

Hon. Ralph Voorhees,
Persifor Marsden Cooke, M. D.
Ashbel King Shepard,
Reginald Heber Smith,
John Cromwell Butler.

Connecticut.

Not represented.

District of Columbia.

Charles Frederick Tiffany Beale,
Henry Greenway Kemp,
William B. Gurley,
Gaillard Hunt.

Florida.

Not represented.

Georgia.

Hon. William D. Harden.

Illinois.

Frank K. Root,
Horace Kent Tenney,
George M. Lyon,
George M. Moulton,
Thomas Floyd-Jones.

Indiana.

Jesse Claiborne Tarkington,
John M. Lilly,
John Greenville Mott,
John L. Pugh.

Iowa.

Henry Cadle.

Kentucky.

Lucas Brodhead,
B. F. Southgate,
John T. Shelby,
Jos. LeCompt.

Maryland.

William B. Wilson,
James Wilson Patterson.

Massachusetts.

Francis Ellingwood Abbot,
Walter Gilman Page.

Michigan.

Henry Perkins,
Robert W. Merrill.

Minnesota.

Rukard Hurd,
Rev. Dudley Ward Rhodes.

Missouri.

Henry Cadle,
Innis Hopkins.
Orlando Powers Bloss,

Montana.

W. H. Raymond.

New Hampshire.

Harry B. Cilley.

New Jersey.

Richard Fowler Stevens, Thomas J. Yorke,
Foster Conárroe Griffith.

New York.

Charlton T. Lewis, Edward Carroll, Jr.

North Carolina.

Not represented.

North Dakota.

Not represented.

Ohio.

Achilles Henry Pugh, Ephraim Morgan Wood,
Frank Johnston Jones, James Verner Guthrie.

Pennsylvania.

Charles Henry Jones, Col. Josiah Granville Leach,
Edward Stalker Sayres, Capt. Henry Hobart Bellas, U.S.A.

Rhode Island.

Not represented.

South Carolina.

Not represented.

Tennessee.

Joshua W. Caldwell, J. Van Deventer.

Texas.

Innis Hopkins.

Virginia.

Charles R. Robins, M. D., William Hall Harris.

Washington.

Not represented.

West Virginia.

Randolph Stalnaker, Sam Hugh Brockunier.

THE CHAIR: The next business in order is the admission of new societies. I believe there are two applications for admission into this society.

MR. MONTGOMERY: Only one that I know of.

THE CHAIR: I am informed there is only one. The Chair will appoint as a *Committee on Credentials*

Mr. F. C. Griffith, of New Jersey;
Mr. Joshua W. Caldwell, of Tennessee, and
Mr. Henry G. Kemp, of the District of Columbia.

MR. WOOD (Ohio): I rise to a point of order. This being a special meeting, called for a special purpose, it is not in order to take up another matter.

JUDGE HARDEN (Georgia): I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that at a special meeting, called for a special purpose, a state was admitted without an objection.

Mr. WOOD (Ohio): I think it would be all right if the point of order was not raised.

JUDGE HARDEN (Georgia): It was raised and overruled.

THE CHAIR: The Chair does not remember as to any special adjourned meeting. The Chair only remembers that at every meeting at which he was present the first business was the admission of new States. The delegates of this society are here, and I should think that this being a meeting of the General Society there could be no objection. The Chair would so decide it.

Mr. Wood: I withdraw my objection, sir, and ask the Chair to rule whether it is in order now to do it. Whether we should continue the business we left off at Philadelphia, whether we should conclude that, before we do anything else. I think in Philadelphia, sir, the point which Judge Harden raises, the admission of the State Society, took place before we entered upon any other business. The question I ask the Chair to rule upon now is whether—

The Chair: If the gentlemen withdraws his objection to it, there would not be any point in the Chair making his decision.

Mr. Wood: I waive my objection so far as to taking up any business now except the special business. I now ask the Chair to rule upon an entirely different point, whether it is the business now. Our point is whether, if it be in order, at what time at this special session is it in order. I am asking a question as to the order of business.

Mr. Vroom (New Jersey): If the Chair will pardon me a moment. The ruling in Philadelphia was based upon this fact. The meeting was a general meeting, called by me in the absence of the President-General for no special purpose, but simply for the purposes of transacting the general business appointed, and for that reason I held that the regular order of business should be carried out, and it was perfectly proper. This is not a meeting called for a special purpose, but is simply the adjournment of the meeting in Philadelphia, and therefore, in my opinion, general business is in order. We did not adjourn for this special purpose, but simply had an adjournment of the meeting in Philadelphia.

Mr. Wood: The Chair will pardon me. I did not know that point would be raised, and I therefore had not considered it, and I supposed that this is not an adjourned meeting of any other meeting of the Society. The Society provided that under certain conditions a meeting should be called in Cincinnati on October 12th. We did not adjourn then the meeting to October 12th because we did not know that the Conference Committee which had been appointed would be ready to report at this time. The resolution specified that "if the Committee of Conference had agreed at that time, the meeting should be called," and therefore I think this is an original meeting.

THE CHAIR: I would call the attention of the gentleman to the next to the last resolution, "That we, the General Society of the Sons of the Revolution, hereby appoint an adjourned meeting of this General Assembly to be held in Cincinnati"—at such a date.

MR. WOOD (Ohio): I am perfectly aware that that language is used, but if the Chair will read on he will see it was not an absolute adjournment. "An adjourned meeting, provided the Joint Committee of Conference approved of union." I take it you cannot adjourn a meeting conditioned upon an action, no matter what condition. This was a meeting. A meeting should be held. Suppose the Conference Committee had not agreed; there would be no meeting held. I leave the point of order with the Chair.

THE CHAIR: The Chair will decide that at a general meeting of the Society, any special business, particularly the important business of the admission of new State societies, would be in order. The Committee named by me can now retire.

THE CHAIR: Have you any correspondence to read?

MR. LEACH (Pennsylvania): It has been our custom when a general meeting was called, to appropriate out of the funds of the General Society a sum toward the expenses of the occasion. I therefore move that the sum of two hundred and fifty dollars, the usual sum, be appropriated at this time and paid to the Treasurer of the Ohio Society.

MR. PUGH (Ohio): As the President of the Ohio Society, I will say, gentlemen, that we cannot accept a proposition which will provide for part of the entertainment of this Society to be paid by the National Society. You are here as our guests, gentlemen, all of you, and we trust that while you are here you will receive such attention that in leaving here the most pleasant recollections of Cincinnati will dwell with you. It may never have occurred to you, that the fact of selecting Cincinnati, in a State which was not one of the original thirteen, is the most happy selection that could possibly have been made. Only a few blocks from here was situated Fort Washington. From it departed General Harmer, who had been the honor and pride of the Revo-

lution. Next in authority was St. Clair, another noble gentleman from the State of Pennsylvania. Following him there came that good soldier of the Revolution, General Wayne, all three Pennsylvanians. To whom do we of Ohio owe more than to the State of Pennsylvania? The State of Ohio has a record of 185 soldiers of the Revolution buried within her soil. The great tidal wave of emigration which followed the Revolution swept over the Alleghanies into the beautiful valley of Ohio, up these valleys of the Miami and Scioto, leaving in their trail a number of the brave men who fought in the Revolutionary War. Every President that Ohio has given to the United States claimed revolutionary descent, from McKinley, who is now President, back to William Henry Harrison, whom we claim as an Ohioan. Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, North Carolina—in fact every State which was one of the original thirteen States, has contributed its best blood to Ohio. Do you know why Ohio is so great? We got all of the best blood of the Revolution. It came out here; and that blood it is that made the Presidents we have furnished. It made a Grant, a Sherman, and a Sheridan; it made Stanton, at the head of the War Department; Chase, at the head of the Treasury during the war; a Chief Justice, and Waite. We have so many men here in this convention that we are able to fill any honors or offices in the United States Government or the Sons of the Revolution. Knowing all these facts, gentlemen, which I have put before you, do you think we can accept the proffer of my dear friend, Mr. Leach, from your Society of the State of Pennsylvania?

Mr. Leach: I press my motion, and I hope that all will vote for it. We do not want to draw any distinction between the Societies who are able and those who are unable to go it alone. In the future we may meet in some States where it would be a serious burden for the local society to cover all the expenses of such meeting.

Mr. Leach's motion seconded, put to vote and carried, Ohio voting "no."

Mr. Kemp (District of Columbia): Mr. President: As the Chairman of this Committee I will report that we have examined the

credentials of the State of Indiana, and the Committee unanimously reports in favor of its admission to membership in this union.

I move that Indiana be admitted.

DR. RHODES (Minnesota): Have the credentials been examined?

MR. MONTGOMERY (New York): They have.

DR. RHODES (Minnesota): Are the credentials here?

MR. MONTGOMERY: No.

DR. RHODES: Isn't it required that the credentials be presented to the committee?

THE CHAIR: Not when they are approved by the Secretary General.

DR. RHODES: What evidence have we that they have been?

THE CHAIR: None but the word of the Secretary General.

DR. RHODES: There is nothing here to show that they have been.

THE CHAIR: The Secretary General is here himself.

DR. RHODES: Excuse me. I beg your pardon.

MR. WOOD: I move that the motion of Mr. Kemp lie upon the table until after the conclusion of the other business of this meeting.

THE CHAIR: The motion of Mr. Wood, is that motion seconded.

(VOICES): "I second the motion."

THE CHAIR: Gentlemen, you have heard the motion.

A DELEGATE: I ask for a call of the roll upon that.

THE CHAIR: The question is upon the motion of Mr. Wood that the motion of Mr. Kemp for the admission of the delegates from the State of Indiana be laid upon the table until after the conclusion of the other business.

The roll call showed the following result:

Carroll, G. P.....No.	Cadwalader, G. T.....No.
Vroom, G. V. P.....No.	Cadle, A. G. T.....Yes.
Schreven, 2 G. V. P.....—	Whipple, G. C.....—
Montgomery, G. S.....No.	Abbot, G. R.....No.
Harris, A. G. S.....No.	Hunt, G. H.....Yes.

Alabama.....—	California.....No.
Colorado.....Yes.	Connecticut.....—
District of Columbia...Yes.	Florida.....—
Georgia.....No.	Illinois.....Yes.
Indiana.....—	Iowa.....Yes.
Kentucky.....Yes.	Maryland.....No.
Massachusetts.....No.	Michigan.....Yes.
Minnesota.....Yes.	Missouri.....Yes.
Montana.....Yes.	New Hampshire.....Yes.
New Jersey.....No.	New York.....No.
North Carolina.....—	North Dakota.....—
Ohio.....Yes.	Pennsylvania.....No.
Rhode Island.....—	South Carolina.....—
Tennessee.....No.	Texas.....Yes.
Virginia.....No.	West Virginia.....Yes.
Washington.....—	

Mr. Harris (Assistant Secretary-General): I have to report, sir, fifteen votes in the affirmative and fifteen votes in the negative.

The Chair: The motion therefore is lost.

Mr. Wood (Ohio): Before the decision of that motion I ask for information, as I know it is always the custom in every body in which I have been that the presiding officer should only vote in case of a tie. Does the constitution provide that the President-General may vote?

The Chair: The Chair would state that he has attended every meeting of this Society since its organization except that held in Philadelphia last year, and in every meeting of this Society the General Officers have been called upon to vote.

The question is decided therefore. On the tie Mr. Wood's motion is lost.

The question now is upon the motion of Mr. Kemp for the admission of Indiana.

The call of the roll resulted as follows:

Carroll, G. P.....Yes.	Cadwalader, G. T.....Yes.
Vroom, G. V. P.....Yes.	Cadle, A. G. T.....No.
Screven, 2 G. V. P.....—	Whipple, G. C.....—
Montgomery, G. S.....Yes.	Abbot, G. R.....Yes.
Harris, A. G. S.....Yes.	Hunt, G. H.....No.
Alabama.....—	California .....Yes.
Colorado.....No.	Connecticut.....—
District of Columbia.....No.	Florida..... —
Georgia .....Yes.	Illinois .....No.
Indiana .....No.	Iowa.....No.
Kentucky.....No.	Maryland.....Yes.
Massachusetts .....Yes.	Michigan.....No.
Minnesota .....No.	Missouri.....No.
Montana.....No.	New Hampshire.....No.
New Jersey.....Yes.	New York.....Yes.
North Carolina.....—	North Dakota.....—
Ohio.....No.	Pennsylvania.....Yes.
Rhode Island.....—	South Carolina.....—
Tennessee.....Yes.	Texas.....No.
Virginia.....Yes.	West Virginia.....No.
Washington .....—	

Mr. Harris (Assistant Secretary-General): I have to report 16 votes in the affirmative and 15 in the negative.

The Chair: The motion is adopted. The delegates from Indiana will enter the hall. We extend our congratulations to the State of Indiana for having its delegates present with us to-day.

The next business in order is the correspondence and resolutions of this Society and the Sons of the American Revolution.

Mr. Wood (Ohio): Mr. Chairman, pardon me for speaking so often. There is one thing vital to our action to-day, the question

of the revision of the rolls. I move that the report of the Committee of the Revision of Rolls be now made.

A Delegate: I second that motion.

The Chair: That motion will be considered adopted unless objection is made. The Chairman is here and probably ready with his report.

Mr. Charles Henry Jones (Pennsylvania): I beg to say, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee has no report to make. No action has been taken by the Committee. No action was possible until some standard of qualification was adopted which the Committee could use as a basis of examination. The General Society of Sons of the Revolution at Savannah and Philadelphia adopted the standard of membership contained in the Constitution of 1893. I now understand that the Constitution which will be reported by the Joint Committee to-day provides that every man who is now a member of the Sons of the Revolution or of the Sons of the American Revolution shall be a member of the proposed new "Society of the American Revolution" whether he is qualified under that Constitution or not. That would leave the Joint Committee on Examination of the Rolls of Membership nothing to do. It was the essential precedent of this whole movement for union of the two Societies, that no man should be a member of the united Societies unless his credentials first underwent the scrutiny of this Joint Committee, and if his claim did not pass the scrutiny of that Committee then he should resign membership. I do not see now what motive there can be for changing this policy of the Society. It cannot be possible that any member would desire to remain as a member of our Society, who could not pass this test. I am, therefore, at a loss, sir, to understand what motive the gentlemen has in making such a motion when he knows the Committee has been unable to do anything. If it be that we are to have a Society that does not represent the main hereditary principle which we have always before maintained, I think this Society ought to meet that question now. Therefore I hope, for this reason, that this motion of the gentlemen from Ohio may be voted down.

The Chair: Will the gentleman state his motion again?

Mr. Wood: (Ohio): The motion is that the Committee on the Revision of Membership Rolls, of which Mr. Jones is Chairman, be now asked to report.

I understand the Chairman to say that the Committee has not acted because he thought there should be some basis or some constitution adopted beforehand. I agree with the gentleman entirely in the matter, that we should adopt, if we are going to have a committee on revision of rolls, that we should adopt some plan of union as it is going to be taken, and then this Committee or some other Committee may act in the matter; that has been our position. While I am on my feet I wish to make a statement which has been made to me by a member of the Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, that they immediately appointed their Committee as provided in our request, and that that Committee has been ready at all times and is ready now to take up the matter of the Revision of the Rolls whenever the Joint Committee shall meet.

Mr. R. F. Stevens (New Jersey): Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Revision of Rolls, I would state that the Committee has never been called together, and has no statement whatever to make.

Mr. Vroom (New Jersey): I desire to correct the statement made by the gentleman from Ohio, and to explain to this Society why as acting President of the Sons of the Revolution, I do not take immediate action in the matter of appointing a Committee on Revision of the Rolls. Every member here will recall the fact, that at the time of the meeting in Philadelphia, in April last, we passed a resolution providing for the appointment by the Chairman of a Committee on the Revision of the Rolls. That resolution was sent to the General Society, the National Society, as it is termed, of the Sons of the American Revolution; that Society did not authorize the appointment of the Committee on the Revision of the Rolls, but it provided for the appointment of the committee to consider the basis of union, and that that committee, if it thought necessary, if it saw fit, should appoint a committee on Revision of the Rolls. I waited until the joint committee met before taking any action. They did not meet until the 24th of August. I was

still uncertain as to whether I ought to appoint the Committee or not. Because if I appointed a committee the gentlemen representing the Sons of the American Revolution might say we do not think it is necessary to have a revision of the rolls. They did not meet us, and so we have appointed a committee. That is not true, as stated by my friend from Ohio. He is laboring under a mistake. I did not appoint the Committee on the 24th of August. It was not until after the joint committee, that is the Committee appointed by the Sons of the American Revolution, on the question of union, found it necessary to appoint a committee to confer with us. It was a matter of the dignity of this Society, and while I was willing to concede that much after letting that whole period elapse without appointing a Committee on the revision of the rolls, still I thought I ought to make the appointment, and I made the appointment as it now stands. I received no official notice of the appointment of the Committee by this Committee of the Sons of the American Revolution. In fact, we were not informed that any action at all has been taken on the subject. That is the history of the matter as it stands.

Mr. Pugh (Ohio): I will state in response to the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey that so far—

The Chair: The Chair will simply state that this argument and debate is by permission of the assembly. There is no question before the house.

Mr. Pugh: On the ground that the Chair heard the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey it might be just as well to say something that will bear upon this subject.

The Chair: All right, sir.

Mr. Pugh (Ohio): In the first place, it was resolved that our general officers are instructed to arrange as soon as it is possible for the appointment of a joint committee of revision, as early as October 12th, 1897, to make a report to the two general assemblies in Cincinnati in accordance with the resolutions passed at Savannah and Richmond in 1896.

The gentleman who has just preceded me in his remarks states that on the 24th of August, that Committee, in pursuance to his resolution was appointed, but in fact, at that time, as I understand him, he had no official knowledge whatever as to the action of the Sons of the American Revolution. He then took the responsibility therefore of appointing the Committee that he was instructed to do, as representing these general officers on the 24th of August. The President and the Chairman of the Committee appointed by the Sons of the American Revolution has informed me, and I presume for that reason the gentleman from Ohio, Captain Wood, made the remarks he did, that he has been ready, and their Committee, as is shown by official correspondence, has been ready at all times to have the rolls revised. They take that position at the present time. They are ready at all times, any time, whenever this Society shall appoint a time to meet to revise its rolls. Our Committee which has been appointed, as I have been informed, has never called a meeting of the Committee. Now there is no gentleman in our body, in this Society, more strenuous than I am in that matter of lineal descent, in insisting on a revision of the rolls and on everything else that would bring about a benefit to this Society. There is not a single society of the Sons of the Revolution that in case any member saw his name should be expunged from the roll would decline to expunge it, and that being the fact, and the plain and manifest intent of our Society's meeting in Philadelphia to have the rolls revised I think it was the duty of the general officers to have immediately appointed that Committee to notify the Sons of the American Revolution that they were ready; and I think when the general officers of that Society (the Sons of the American Revolution) delegated to that Committee of Conference the authority to appoint that Committee, it had just as much authority as it could give when we delegate that authority to our different officers. Had the Revision Committee met and revised the rolls, it would have furnished a basis, probably, that would have been in accord with what many of the gentlemen here desire.

The Chair: The Chair would state that there is more important business now before the convention, and as there is no

question now before the house on the subject of the revision of the rolls, we will proceed with the usual order of business.

The business is the report of the Conference Committee, appointed on the 19th of April last in Philadelphia, on the subject of the union of the two societies.

MR. PUGH (Ohio): The copy of the report, which has just been distributed among the members of this Society (in buff color), is the report of the Committee. Is it desired by the Chair that the Chairman of the Committee should read the report?

JUDGE HARDEN: As it bears upon subjects of extremely great importance to all these patriotic and hereditary societies, it is in my hands now for the first time, although it is true I had a former report which I am told it is not like. It is in the hands of a majority of the gentlemen for the first time. Can we vote intelligently upon a paper with the contents of which we are necessarily unacquainted and should be read?

MR. PUGH: Is it the desire that the report be read?

The report is as follows:

To EDWIN SHEPARD BARRETT, *President General of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution,*

And JOHN LEE CARROLL, *General President of the General Society of the Sons of the Revolution.*

The Committees of the Sons of the American Revolution and the Sons of the Revolution, who were appointed by their respective Societies to confer together upon the subject of union of the two Societies, beg leave to report jointly for the consideration of each Society the result of their labors.

First: They were profoundly impressed by evidences of a universal sentiment favoring union reaching them from members of both National Societies, as well as with the cordiality and harmony inspiring the members of the Committees, who approached the difficult and delicate task assigned them with great deliberation and with a deep sense of responsibility.

Second: The two Committees met, on the call of their respective Chairmen, in a joint conference on basis of Union, and after a careful consideration of the Constitution and Plan of Union of 1893, and proposed changes thereto, unanimously decided upon and do now recommend the adoption of the following Basis of Union:—

Basis of Union.

1. The members of the two National Societies shall unite in forming the National Society of the American Revolution by the adoption of the Constitution hereinafter following and the election of officers as provided therein, at a meeting to be held jointly in the City of Cincinnati, Ohio, October 12, 1897.

2. The General Board of Managers shall designate the Colors, Seal and Insignia and direct a rule or rules for wearing Insignia and use of colors.

3. The Insignia of either or both existing Societies may be worn on ceremonial occasions with the Insignia of the United Society or alone.

4. The State Societies of both existing Societies shall report the adoption of a constitution in accordance with the new National Constitution, to the Secretary General promptly on that action being taken, or united State organization effected.

5. The Treasurer General of each existing National Society shall turn over to the new Treasurer General when he shall be duly qualified, all balances in their respective treasuries, taking his vouchers therefor.

6. The Registrars General of the two existing societies shall turn over all records and documents in their respective offices to the New Registrar General when he shall have been duly qualified, taking his voucher therefor.

7. The Constitution recommended herein shall become operative by virtue of its ratification by the delegates of a majority of the States of each National Society voting at the joint meeting of the two National Societies contemplated.

CONSTITUTION

OF THE

NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

Preamble.

We, the lineal descendants of Revolutionary Sires, inspired by the heroic deeds of a liberty-loving ancestry, in order to form a more perfect union of patriotic men, to foster true patriotism and love of country; to cherish and maintain the institutions of American freedom, do ordain this Constitution.

Article I.

The name of the Society shall be "The Society of the American Revolution."

Article II.

The objects of this Society are, to perpetuate the memory of the men who, in the military, naval or civil service of the Colonies and of the Continental Congress, by their acts or counsel, achieved the Independence, of this country; to further proper celebrations of the anniversaries of the birthday of Washington, and of prominent events connected with the War of the Revolution; to collect, publish and secure for preservation the rolls, records and other documents relating to that period; to mark by appropriate monuments historic places; to impress upon the present and future generations the patriotic spirit which actuated our ancestors in establishing the Republic of the United States, and to promote the feeling of friendship among its members.

Article III.

Section 1. Any male person above the age of twenty-one years, of good character, and a lineal descendant of an ancestor who shall be proven by official record or other equivalent evidence to have

served as a military, naval or marine officer; soldier, sailor, or marine, in actual service, under the authority of any of the thirteen Colonies or States, of the Continental Congress, or Vermont, or a lineal descendant of one who signed the Declaration of Independence, or of one who, as a member of the Continental Congress, or of the Congress of any of the Colonies or States, or as an official appointed by or under the authority of any such legislative bodies, actually assisted in the establishment of American Independence by overt acts of resistance to the authority of Great Britain during the War of the American Revolution, prior to the declaration of peace in 1783, shall be eligible to membership in the Society.

Provided, That when the claim of eligibility is based on the service of an ancestor in the "minute men" or "militia," it must be satisfactorily shown that such ancestor was actually called into the service of one of the thirteen original States, or Vermont, or United States, and performed military duties; and

Provided further, That when the claim of eligibility is based on the service of an ancestor as a "sailor" or "marine," it must in like manner be shown that such service was other than shore duty and regularly performed in the Continental Navy or the Navy of one of the original thirteen States, or Vermont, or on an armed vessel, other than a merchant ship, which sailed under letters of marque and reprisal, and that such ancestor of the applicant was duly enrolled in the ship's company, either as an officer, seaman, or otherwise than as a passenger; and

Provided further, That when the claim of eligibility is based on the service of an ancestor as an "official," such service must have been performed in the civil service of the United States, or of one of the thirteen original States, or Vermont, and must have been sufficiently important in character to have rendered the official liable to arrest and imprisonment, the same as a combatant, if captured by the enemy.

In the construction of this article, the Volunteer Aides-de-Camp of General Officers in the Continental Service, who were duly announced as such and who actually served in the field during a campaign, shall be comprehended as having performed qualifying service.

No service of an ancestor shall be deemed as qualifying service

for membership in "The Society of American Revolution," where such ancestor, after assisting in the cause of American Independence, shall have subsequently either adhered to the enemy or failed to maintain an honorable record throughout the War of the Revolution.

No person shall be admitted unless he be eligible under one of the provisions of this article, nor unless he be of good moral character and be judged worthy of becoming a member.

Section 2. That every member of the Society of the Sons of the Revolution and of the Society of the Sons of the American Revolution in good standing at the time of the adoption of this constitution, who has been admitted to either of these societies under their respective constitutions and the by-laws of their respective National Societies, shall be enrolled as a member of this Society.

Section 3. Applications for membership shall be made to any State Society, in duplicate, upon blank forms prescribed by the General Board of Managers, and shall in each case set forth the name, occupation and residence of the applicant, his line of descent, and the name, residence and services of his ancestor or ancestors in the Revolution, from which he derives eligibility. The applicant shall make oath or affirmation that the statements of his application are true to the best of his knowledge and belief. Upon the approval of an application by the State Society, to which it is made, one copy shall be transmitted to the Registrar General of the National Society, who shall examine the same and upon approval notify the Secretary of the State Society. If satisfied that the application is not properly made out, he shall return it for correction. No election of a new member shall be valid unless his eligibility shall be approved by the Registrar General.

Article IV.

National and State Societies.

Section 1. The National Society shall embrace all the members of the State Societies now existing or which may hereafter be established under this Constitution.

Section 2. Whenever in any State or Territory, in which a State Society does not exist, or in which a State Society has become inactive or failed for two years to pay its annual dues to the National Society, fifteen or more persons duly qualified for membership in this Society may associate themselves as a State Society of the American Revolution, and organize in accordance with this Constitution; they may be admitted by the General Board of Managers of the National Society as "The ———— Society of the American Revolution," and shall thereafter have exclusive local jurisdiction in the State or Territory, or in the District in which they are organized, subject to the provisions of this Constitution; but this provision shall not be construed so as to exclude the admission of members living in other States.

Section 3. Each State Society shall judge of the qualifications of its members and of those proposed for membership, subject to the provisions of this Constitution, and shall regulate all matters pertaining to its own affairs. It shall have authority to establish local chapters within its own jurisdiction and to endow the chapters with such power as it may deem proper, not inconsistent with this Constitution. It shall have authority, after due notice and impartial trial, to expel any member, who, by conduct unbecoming a gentlemen, shall render himself unworthy to remain a member of the Society.

Section 4. Each State Society shall submit to the Annual Congress of the National Society a report, setting forth by name, the additions, transfers and deaths, and any other changes in the membership and progress of the State Society during the preceding year, and make such suggestions, as it shall deem proper, for the promotion of the objects of the whole Society.

Section 5. Whenever a member, in good standing in his Society, changes his residence from the jurisdiction of the State Society of which he is a member, to that of another, he shall be entitled, if he so elects, to a certificate of honorable demission from his own State Society, in order that he may be transferred to the State Society to whose jurisdiction he has changed his residence; provided, that his membership shall continue in the former until he shall have been elected a member of the latter. Each State Society

shall, however, retain full control of the admission of members by transfer.

Section 6. Whereever the word "State" occurs in this Constitution, it shall be held to include within its meaning the District of Columbia and the Territories of the United States.

Section 7. A Society may be formed in any foreign country by fifteen or more persons who are eligible to membership under this Constitution, which shall bear the same relation to the National Society as a State Society, subject to the provisions of this Constitution.

Article V.

Officers and Managers.

Section 1. The General Officers of the National Society shall be, President-General, Five Vice-Presidents-General, Secretary-General, Assistant Secretary-General, Treasurer-General, Assistant Treasurer-General, Registrar-General, Assistant Registrar-General, Historian-General, Chancellor-General, and Chaplain-General, who shall be elected by ballot by a vote of the majority of the members present at the annual meeting of the Congress of the National Society and shall hold office for one year and until their successors shall be elected.

Section 2. The General Officers shall constitute the General Board of Managers of the National Society, which Board shall have authority to adopt and promulgate the By-Laws of the National Society, to prescribe the duties of the General Officers, to provide the seal, to designate and make regulations for the issue of the insignia, and to transact the general business of the National Society during the intervals between the sessions of the Congress. Meetings of the General Board may be held, after not less than ten days' notice, at the call of the President-General, or, in case of his absence or inability, at the call of the Senior Vice-President-General, certified by the Secretary-General. Meetings shall be called at the request of seven members. At all such meetings seven shall constitute a quorum.

Section 3. An Executive Committee of seven, of whom the President-General shall be the Chairman, may be elected by the

Board of Managers, which committee shall, in the interim between the meetings of the Board, transact such business as shall be delegated to it by the Board of Managers.

Article VI.

Dues.

Each State Society shall pay annually to the Treasurer-General, to defray the expenses of the National Society, twenty-five cents for each active member thereof. All such dues shall be paid on or before the first day of April in each year for the ensuing year, in order to secure representation in the meetings of the National Society.

Article VII.

Meetings and Elections.

Section 1. The annual meeting of the National Society for the election of the General Officers and for transaction of business, shall be held on the 19th day of April of each year, unless the same falls on Sunday, when it shall be held on the 20th. The time, hour, and place of such meeting shall be designated by the Board of Managers.

Section 2. Special meetings of the Congress may be called by the President-General, and shall be called by him when directed so to do by the Board of Managers, or whenever requested in writing so to do by at least three State Societies, on giving thirty days' notice, specifying the time and place of such meetings and the business to be transacted.

Section 3. The following shall be members of all such annual or special meetings of the Congress and shall be entitled to vote therein :

(1). All the officers and ex-Presidents-General of the National Society.

(2). The President and Secretary of each State Society as delegates at large.

(3). One delegate from each State Society for each one hundred members of the Society within a State, and for a fraction of fifty members or over.

Article VIII.

Amendments.

This Constitution may be altered or amended at any meeting of the National Society, when the same shall have been recommended by a State Society. A notice of the proposed amendment or alteration shall be sent by the Secretary-General to the President of each Society sixty days in advance of such meeting. An affirmative vote of two-thirds of the States present shall be necessary for their adoption.

Article IX.

This Constitution shall take effect when ratified by a majority of the States of each National Society voting in Joint Meeting.

We would respectfully recommend that in the event of the adoption of our report by the two National bodies to whom it is submitted, that they immediately meet together in joint session for the purpose of completing the organization herein provided for.

For the Sons of the Revolution :

Achilles Henry Pugh,
Chairman,
Timothy L. Woodruff,
Horace Kent Tenney.
Gaillard Hunt.

Francis E. Abbott,
dissenting.
A. H. Pugh,
Chairman.

For the Sons of the American Revolution :

James M. Richardson,
Chairman,
George H. Shields,
Nathan Warren,
Ebenezer J. Hill,
Samuel Eberly Gross.

(Mr. Pugh's reading of the Conference Committee's report was suspended for the following business and then resumed.)

Mr. Wood (Ohio) : Will the gentlemen allow me to interrupt him a moment ? Outside there is a Committee from the Sons of

the American Revolution, headed by General Breckenridge, with a resolution from the Sons of the American Revolution which they ask to convey to the Chair.

THE CHAIR: The Chair would say it is a proper courtesy to show that Society that we suspend this reading until we hear what they have to say. The Secretary will, of course, convey any message that there may be from the President.

Mr. Montgomery, Secretary-General, retires, and returns with the Committee of the Sons of the American Revolution, whom he introduces to the Chair and the meeting.

GENERAL BRECKENRIDGE (Sons of the American Revolution): Mr. President and gentlemen, we are here from the Sons of the American Revolution to present the following resolutions in writing, which we will either hand you, or read, as may be your pleasure. The resolution is: "We, The Sons of the American Revolution, in Congress Assembled, prior to the formal reception and action upon the Report of the Joint Committee having the matter of union in charge, do

"*Resolve*, That fraternal greetings are hereby extended to our brethren of the Sons of the Revolution, with expressions of the kindliest congratulations that in the faithful attempt to unite all descendants of Revolutionary ancestors in a common cause and a single organization, we are again under the same roof, and have every hope that a more perfect union will be effected, with all honor to these Societies, and every prospect of greater usefulness to our beloved country. Attested: Edwin Shepard Barrett, President-General, Franklin Murphy, Secretary-General." (Applause.)

(The Committee from the Society of Sons of the American Revolution retires.)

THE CHAIR: Now, Mr. Chairman, will you proceed with your reading?

DR. RHODES (Minnesota): Mr. President, I would like to move that a Committee be appointed by the Chair, representing the Sons of the Revolution, to convey to the Sons of the American

Revolution our cordial appreciation of their message, and our kindly reciprocation of their sentiments.

Seconded, put to vote and carried.

THE CHAIR: I will name a Committee of three, composed of
Dr. Dudley Ward Rhodes, of Minnesota,
Mr. Ephraim Morgan Wood, of Ohio, and
Mr. Gaillard Hunt, of the District of Columbia.

MR. WOOD (Ohio): It ought to be in the shape of a resolution passed by this Society, and let the Committee convey it.

Governor Bushnell, of Ohio, here entered the room.

THE CHAIR: Will the Society kindly suspend business for a few minutes while the Chair has a few words of courtesy with the Governor of the State?

The Chair and Governor Bushnell converse.

Governor Bushnell retires.

THE CHAIR: Gentlemen, the Society will be in order.

DR. ABBOT (Massachusetts): Mr. President, as a member of the Conference Committee, I beg leave to submit a minority report. Shall I be allowed to read it?

THE CHAIR: Certainly; it is the courtesy of the Convention to allow a minority report.

DR. RHODES (Minnesota): I offer the following resolution:

"To the Society of the Sons of the American Revolution: Gentlemen: The Society of the Sons of the Revolution, in convention assembled, conveys to your Society the cordial appreciation of the kindly and courteous resolution just presented, and heartily reciprocates the same."

Seconded, put to vote.

THE CHAIR: The motion is unanimously adopted, and the gentlemen of the Committee will kindly present it to the Sons of the American Revolution.

Dr. Abbot reads the minority report.

MINORITY REPORT

FROM THE

Joint Committee of Conference on Basis of Union, by Francis Ellingwood Abbot, Member of the Committee and General Registrar of the Sons of the Revolution.

Note.—This Minority Report is based on the draft of the proposed new Constitution adopted by the majority of the Committee at their meeting of August 24, 1897, and afterwards printed. It is, of course, subject to whatever changes may yet be made at their final meeting of October 11.

I should add that there was a meeting of the Joint Committee held last evening, and some amendments were made to the Conference Committee's report, but there was no one made that seemed to me to cover fully the ground; therefore, I shall beg leave to read my report just as it is printed, and the members can make what comments they please after comparing it with the report which has just been read.

To the General Society of Sons of the Revolution, Convened at Cincinnati, October 12, 1897*:*

Gentlemen,—As a member of the committee of five, appointed by you at Philadelphia last April to meet a like committee of five in behalf of the National Society of Sons of the American Revolution, in order "to consider the constitution and plan of union of 1893, and all proposed changes thereto, and come to an agreement, if possible, respecting a new general constitution and a plan of union between the Societies," it has become my painful but imperative duty, in discharge of the honorable and highly responsible trust thus imposed upon me, to submit to you now a minority report.

The conviction is rapidly and irresistibly deepening, not only throughout our own society, but in the public mind as well, that there ought to be only a single organization of Sons of the Revolution. If two existing societies can only be wisely united in a single national body, no limit can easily be set to its growth, its glory, or its influence for good. Its membership, grounded on lineal descent during a century and a quarter from nearly four hundred thousand patriot soldiers of the Revolution, may yet mount up into the millions. Imagination can scarcely exaggerate the potency and promise of such a vast patriotic fellowship, knit together by fidelity to the heroic memories of the past, and fired by devotion to the free principles out of which has sprung a free empire, destined, as we all hope and believe, to cast into the shade all despotic empires of the present or the future. Back of the great parties in Church and State which divide the people into semi-hostile camps, over and above all political, sectional, or sectarian antagonisms, such a fellowship built on pure love of our common country would go far to convert into a shining fact the grand ideal of our national motto, *E Pluribus Unum.* It would do much to conquer that worst enemy of the republic against which our immortal Washington so eloquently and solemnly warned us in his Farewell Address—that insidious and corrupting *party-spirit* which still threatens to destroy us by decay from within. More effectively than any other society, it would help to join the East and the West, the North and the South, in the bonds of brotherhood and self-consecration to the highest welfare of the country. Not for slight or petty obstacles, then, should our effort to fulfil our destiny and our duty as a single vast society be suffered to cease.

But success in this effort is subject to certain inexorable conditions from which we cannot escape. No union of our now divided forces, however desirable in itself, ought to be desired by us unless the terms of that union are in strictest accordance with the fundamental principle of our own society; namely, that *each and every individual member shall be a lineal descendant of a Revolutionary ancestor, and shall prove his Revolutionary services, not by private family tradition, but by public official record.* By that principle must we stand or fall. Whatever else we may concede for the sake

of harmony and union, we cannot abandon or weaken that principle without suicide as a society. If that principle is not made the very cornerstone of the new organization, the organization itself will be a fraud upon the public and a shame to ourselves. For it must stand before the world as guaranteeing the Revolutionary descent of every one of its own members. If it deliberately admits a single man whose right of membership is not honestly proved by the record, it will justify doubt and suspicion respecting the right of every other member. No one of us here present can consent to the abandonment or weakening of the principle of *documentary proof of Revolutionary descent*, as the rigorous condition of membership in the new society, without distroying the value of his own membership and incurring the suspicion of having connived in a fraud. The doubt which hangs over one will hang over all. Such a price of union as that is more than we can afford to pay.

So profoundly do I feel my own responsibility as one of those to whom you have delegated the task of framing honorable terms of union, that I cannot flinch from pointing out to you frankly that some of the terms contained in the constitution reported to you by the majority of the committee violate the fundamental principle of our society, and are not such as we ought to sanction.

Objections to the Constitution Reported by the Majority.

I. In order to understand the gravity of the first violation of our fundamental principle, it is necessary to state that no meeting of the committee as such was held until August 24, more than four months after you appointed it on April 19; and that meeting I could not attend because I failed to receive the notice of it till after the day had gone by. The first draft of a provisional constitution I received on July 2. In this draft, the first section of Article III read as follows:

"Section 1. Any male person above the age of twenty-one years, of good character, and a lineal descendant of one who shall be *shown by official record* to have served, *etc.*, shall be eligible to membership in the Society."

The words "shown by official record" had apparently been adopted from pencilled suggestions of my own on an earlier proof of that separate Article, and I supposed they would be allowed to stand. But in the second draft of the provisional constitution as a whole, which was sent to me on August 17, this same section read as follows:

"Section 1. Any male person above the age of twenty-one years, of good character, and a lineal descendant of an ancestor who shall be *proven* to have served, *etc.*, shall be eligible to membership in the Society."

This change of the explicit words "shown by official record" into the vague single word "proven" is a distinct and undeniable lowering of the standard of proof. Such a change could not have been accidental or unintentional. But it violates our fundamental principle. "Proven" how? "Proven" by official record? Or "proven" by mere tradition? The word is open to either interpretation. It opens a question which for us has been a closed question from the beginning. We cannot afford to leave that an open question in the constitution of the new society, unless for the sake of union we are prepared to surrender our fundamental principle, and abandon the proud position we have thus far held. That price of union is too high.

Let me add that in the official copy this amendment has partly been made; they have restored it so that it shall read: "proven by official record, or other equivalent proof," but they strike out the word, "documentary." I thought the word "documentary" was essential to keep clear and plain that we meant documents, original documents, and not mere tradition of any sort. It is a very great improvement over the simple word "proven," but it does not go the full length of our contention.

II. In order to understand the second violation of our fundamental principle, it is necessary to quote this brief but very significant avowal in a letter addressed to me by the Chairman on September 3d:—

"That committee (of revision) may come to the same conclusion that we did, namely, that to form a union we must accept the membership as it exists to-day."

What right had a mere committee of yours, appointed by you for a limited and strictly defined purpose, to come to any conclusion whatever on another matter which you did not intrust to them at all? Above all, to set aside your own deliberate and twice declared conclusion that the existing membership cannot be accepted without revision? Your Savannah invitation was issued under the strict proviso that the existing membership in both societies shall be revised, and all mistakes corrected, that no member shall be admitted into the consolidated society who is not, after careful re-examination of his claims, found eligible under the rules established in the constitution of 1893. This proviso was accepted and approved in the most explicit terms by the National Society of Sons of the American Revolution, which unanimously and solemnly "pledged" itself at Richmond to erase the names of all persons found ineligible under those same rules of 1893. Lastly, in creating two independent committees last April at Philadelphia, one for conference on basis of union and one for revision of the rolls, you reaffirmed your own conclusion that you will not accept without revision the membership as it exists to-day. In face of these unanimous declarations by both general societies, which are decisive and final on this point of revision, and which form a solemn compact that revision of the rolls shall precede union of the societies, it strikes me as a betrayal of trust, in which I cannot join, for a mere committee of yours, not only to come itself to a contrary conclusion, but actually to embody it in the constitution they now report to you! For this is what they have done in Section 2 of Article III, as follows:—

"Section 2. *Provided further*, That every member of the Society of Sons of the Revolution and of the Society of Sons of the American Revolution in good standing at the time of the adoption of this Constitution, who has been admitted to either of those Societies under their respective Constitutions and the By-laws of their respective National Societies, shall be enrolled as a member of this Society. *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be so construed as to admit a descendant of any one who may have been admitted under this clause, whose claims are either derived from collateral descent or from services which are not within the other provisions as to eligibility in this Constitution."

The first part of this section enrolls in the proposed society, without question, every member of both the existing societies, and thereby abolishes at a blow all reason for revising the rolls. Such a recommendation from our committee usurps the function of the committee on revision, transcends and violates your own instructions, destroys the fundamental principle of our society, and tramples upon the unanimous agreement of both societies. Surely, such a recommendation ought not to be adopted. The second part of the section confesses, by unavoidable implication, that some of the members thus enrolled (for all we know, a majority of them) have no valid right of membership whatever; and it therefore provides that their descendants shall not be admitted at all. What a confession to make in the constitution of a society that respects itself, or desires to be respected! Would it not deservedly make the society an object of universal ridicule and contempt? By throwing a cloud of suspicion and doubt over the claim of every single member, would it not annihilate the social value of every membership? The only thing that can be wisely done with such a section as this is to strike it out altogether; for it is an attempt to overthrow and repeal that agreement on *revision of the rolls as the prior condition of union of the societies*, which has been irrevocably established by the unanimous vote of each general society. There can be no going back of that vote on either side without dishonor and disgrace; and I cannot, as a member of the committee, join in recommending to you any step so disastrous, so contrary to every principle of good faith, so certain to point against us the finger of scorn. I, for one, am unwilling to admit that these two great societies were engaged last year in a mere game of bluff.

III. On different but equally grave grounds, I find myself unable to assent to two of the clauses in the second section of Article V. It is there declared that the General Officers of the new society shall have authority "to provide the seal" and "to designate * * * the insignia." No arrangement, in my opinion, could be more ill-judged than to postpone those questions till after the union has been effected. It throws an apple of discord into the midst of the new society. Two parties will at once start up on the lines of the old societies, each struggling to secure the adoption

of its own original seal and insignia. It takes very little insight into human nature to foresee in this contention, if not the seed of a new schism, at least the certainty of angry but useless quarrels. Let us build more wisely. Let us remember that we ought to build for all time, and to lay now the foundations of a great patriotic society which shall live as long as the Great Republic. Those clauses of Article V. ought to be stricken out altogether. The questions of the seal and the insignia ought to be decided now, prior to consolidation, so as to avoid the unnecessary revival of old heartburnings and jealousies which we hope to heal forever. Let us not throw a blazing torch into the house we are building.

IV. Further, I find myself compelled to protest against Article IX, as it stands now in the majority report, because it is both impracticable and unjust. It reads as follows:—

"Article IX. This constitution shall take effect when ratified by a majority of the States of each National Society voting in Joint Convention."

In the first place, it would be practically impossible to take a separate vote of each national society, whether by States or by delegates, when the two societies sit indiscriminately in one joint convention.

In the next place, even if such a vote could be taken, it would be unfair. Only such State Societies as approve union would be represented in the joint convention, and a majority of these State Societies might be a minority in their own National Society. If, as I hope, union is to come at last, it ought to be an honorable and universally satisfactory union, which can be effected only by a clear majority of the States in each National Society. No wrong should be done to the State Societies which at present oppose union; yet this Article practically disfranchises them. Union on such terms would be an iniquity and a failure. The friends of union ought to rely on kindness and justice alone, and for that reason Article IX. ought not to be adopted as it stands.

V. Although there are many minor points open to criticism in the constitution reported by the majority, chiefly because this constitution was based on the constitution of the Sons of the American Revolution, and not, as required by your resolutions appointing the committee, on the constitution of 1893, the only

other provision to which I must absolutely decline to assent is Article I, which declares the *name* of the new society. On this point I will now touch in a different connection.

Plan of Union.

In obedience to your instructions requiring the committee not only to report "a new general constitution and a plan of union," but also to submit to you their "recommendations respecting them," I beg leave now to submit my own.

The chief points on which the two Societies, before they unite, should come to a clear and definite agreement, are these:

1. *Revision of the Rolls.* On this point I would recommend that each of the two General Societies appoint immediately one historical expert from its own membership; that the two experts thus appointed select a third who is not a member of either Society; that these three experts, as the joint Committee of Revision, make a report in strict accordance with the Savannah and Richmond Resolutions, and submit it to the two General Societies at their respective annual meetings in April, 1898; that they be adequately paid for the time and labor, and necessary expenses involved; and that formal adoption of their report by each General Society be a prior condition of the actual union of the two Societies.

2. *Name of the new Society.* This is a point of supreme interest and importance to us all, for upon wisdom in this respect must largely depend the harmony, prosperity and prestige of the new Society itself. There is but one way to secure these objects: avoidance of all unnecessary change and self-evident justice, impartiality and equality in whatever change may prove necessary. Both of the present names contain, as a common element, the word "Sons" and the word "Revolution"; both of these words can be and ought to be scrupulously preserved. Above all, the word "Sons" deserves to be guarded as our peculiar glory. It is picturesque, poetic, unique; it stirs the blood and fires the imagination; it revives memories of the Revolutionary "Sons of Liberty," and quickens our gratitude for the sacrifices of our patriotic "forefathers." Nothing but captious

tastelessness can cavil at it. To throw away this grand old Anglo-Saxon word "Sons" for the tame and commonplace Latin derivative "Society" would, in the eyes of all who know how to appreciate the great masters of good English, convict us of having rude and uncultured minds. "Sons" utters in one sturdy syllable all that is uttered in the seven syllables, "lineal male descendants;" it utters, as "Society" does not, our essential principal of heredity; it renders impossible what the word "Society" directly provokes—agitation in the near future for the admission of female members and for inclusion of the "Daughters" as well as the "Sons" in a single organization; in short, it is the absolutely best word to tell the world exactly what we are. Whatever else is changed, that word "Sons" should be jealously guarded from all change. The only point worth debating is whether the last part of the name shall be "of the Revolution," or "of the American Revolution," or something else instead of either. Here, in my own opinion, a just, conservative, and satisfactory compromise is possible. The only strong reason for inserting the word "American" is the fact that there have been many "Revolutions," and that we ought, therefore, to say what "Revolution" we have in mind. This is a fair demand. But the reasoning proves too much. Not only have there been many "Revolutions," but many "American Revolutions," likewise—in Mexico, in Central America, in South America. If we are to encourage branch societies in foreign lands, as proposed in Section 7 of Article IV, and hence in other American countries than our own, we cannot afford to put forth the arrogant claim that our country is all America, or our "Revolution" "*the* American Revolution." That would insult and justly offend the citizens of our sister American republics. Let us be modest—let us be true. In loose common talk, it may do well enough to speak of ours as "*the* American Revolution," but it will not do in our deliberately chosen name. We ought to be more generous and more just. The unanswerable objection to defining "the Revolution" as "*the* American Revolution" is the simple fact that this does not correctly define it. Let us concede to our sister society that they are right in asking us to define what "Revolution" we mean; let them concede to us that we are right in asking them to define it correctly. Here are equal, just and honorable

concessions to make. All just claims will be met if we define the "Revolution" *by its date*, and adopt as the full name of the new Society, "Sons of the Revolution of 1776." The date defines correctly and completely, for there was only one "Revolution of 1776," and that one is exactly what our friends mean, but do not define, by "*the American* Revolution." If, however, the name "Sons of the Revolution of 1776" should be objected to as too long, or as appearing to favor our own society at the expense of the Sons of the American Revolution, it could be shortened, according to the happy suggestion of Rear Admiral Roe, into the still simpler name "Sons of '76." This name has, at least, the merit of recalling the "Spirit of '76," and would touch a chord to which every patriotic heart responds. For one, I would cheerfully consent to adopt this name, to the sacrifice of my own preference, rather than have the members of our sister society believe that we wish to take more than justly belongs to us in naming the new society. Nevertheless, remembering that, in the end, the name which is best in itself will best stand the test of time, and will best please our own posterity, I trust that all fair minds will recognize the superior fulness and dignity of the longer name, and not insist on marring it by unnecessary abbreviation. I recommend, therefore, that in a spirit of conciliation and honorable compromise we consent to accept this name for the new society: "Sons of the Revolution of 1776." This will preserve for us that old and felicitous name (a little lengthened, but not at all mangled) which occurred to the founders of our society by a happy inspiration of genius; yet it will courteously add that fuller definition at which the founders of our sister society very properly aimed. Could a fairer solution of this difficulty about the name be desired? So far as it goes, the name we now have is the absolutely best name possible, and it will not be hurt by adding the date. The name now offered to us, "The Society of the War for American Independence," is unspeakably bad. At least, in the choice between "Sons" and "Society," let us not throw away a nugget of pure gold in order to pick up a cobblestone in its stead.

3. *Colors of the New Society.* With regard to this point, on which the constitution submitted by the majority is wholly silent, it would be an honorable compromise to combine the colors of both

societies; and I therefore recommend that the new society adopt as its own the three colors of buff, blue, and white. Buff and blue were the colors of the Continental officers, white and blue those of the Continental privates. It would be no loss to either society, but a manifest gain, if the new society to be formed out of both should combine their three colors, and thus represent not only the whole army of heroes whose sons we are proud to be, but also the white royal flag of France, the gallant ally without whose aid even that army of heroes would hardly have won the desperate battle of Independence.

4. *Seal, insignia, and diploma of the new society.* With respect to the seal, the diploma or certificate of membership, and the insignia (including under this term the badge, the button, and the ribbons, although it is often used ungrammatically of the badge alone), I would recommend that these matters be referred to a special joint committee of the two societies, constituted just like the above-mentioned committee of revision, who shall be instructed to consult professional experts on the subject and submit to both general societies entirely new designs, which, if approved by both, shall be ordained thereby for the new society. But I would also recommend that continued use of the present badges, buttons, and diplomas of both societies be authorized and legalized for all who now possess them, and that only the new ones, after union is actually accomplished, be issued either to old or to new members. In this way, a perfectly honorable compromise on this subject may be arranged, yet without imposing any unnecessary expense on the present members of either society.

5. *Constitution of the new society.* On this all-important point, I would recommend that, in order to make the best of existing circumstances, and persevere in the effort to secure an honorable union, the constitution reported by the majority be now ratified by you, provided, and only provided, you deem it wise to amend it in five essential respects.

Five Amendments Submitted.

I would recommend that the constitution reported by the majority of the committee be amended as follows:

First, by striking out the name proposed in Article I and substituting the words "Sons of the Revolution of 1776" in this Article and wherever the name occurs in this constitution; also, by adding to Article I the words, "and its colors shall be buff, blue, and white,"

Secondly, by striking out the word "proven" in the third line of Section 1 of Article III, and substituting the words "shown by public official record or equivalent documentary proof."

Thirdly, by striking out altogether, without substitute, the whole of Section 2, of Article III, as a violation of the fundamental agreement to revise the rolls, arrived at by unanimous vote of both societies at Savannah and Richmond in 1896.

Fourthly, by striking out, without substitute, the two clauses in Section 2, of Article V, comprised in the words "to provide the seal, to designate and make regulations for the issue of the insignia."

Fifthly, by striking out in Article IX the words "voting in Joint Convention," and by changing the whole Article so that it may read thus: "This Constitution shall take effect when ratified by a majority of the States of each National Society voting in a separate convention, and when finally adopted, but without amendment at that time, by a joint convention held under a concurrent call of the two separate conventions."

If it be in accordance with parliamentary law, I hereby move the adoption of these five amendments as a whole, and make this motion a part of this minority report. But if not, I beg some other member to make that motion, to the end that you need not waste your valuable time on side issues or trivial and unessential points.

Lastly, in order to make our own position clear as the sun to all the world, I would recommend that we now adopt resolutions substantially to the following effect:—

"*Resolved*, That we, the General Society of Sons of the Revolution, stand prepared to unite with the National Society of Sons of the American Revolution in calling a joint convention of the two societies, for the final adoption of the new general constitution as first amended and then ratified at this meeting, and for the election of new general officers under it, whenever strict revision of all the rolls of both societies has been actually effected, in accordance with

the mutual agreement to revise them which was unanimously made by both societies at their respective meetings in Savannah and Richmond, in April, 1896.

"*Resolved*, that no further steps towards union of the two societies ought to be or will be taken by this society, until this prior revision of the rolls of both societies has been actually made by a competent and disinterested joint committee, and formally approved by each society voting in a separate convention; for the self-evident reason that, if we profess in the new Preamble to be without exception 'lineal descendants of Revolutionary Sires,' we are collectively and individually bound in good faith to each other and to the world to rest that proud claim upon conclusive documentary proof in the case of every single member."

That these two resolutions should be adopted, Mr. Chairman, to show where we stand and why we remain two societies.

One word of personal explanation may be allowed me in closing. It is with the deepest regret that I have been forced to withhold my assent from the report of this committee, but respect for your authority and clear instructions permits no other course. You did not empower this committee to lower your own standard of proof, or to reverse your own decision that the rolls must be revised before you can consent to union; and I cannot join in the usurpation of such powers. If we adopt this constitution as it stands printed, you and I are called upon to guarantee the truth of claims which, for aught we know, may be false—to sanction the membership of men of whom we do not know, and cannot know, that they have in their veins one drop of Revolutionary blood. Moreover, in the case of each and every member, the standard of proof is so lowered that it puts on one and the same level proof by official record and proof by mere oral tradition. Who of us is not opposed to union under a constitution which claims in its preamble that "We" are "the lineal descendants of Revolutionary Sires," yet confesses in its third article that some of us have so little right to make this proud claim that their descendants shall be excluded from membership? Who of us is hardy enough to maintain that such a society as that would not be what I have called it—a fraud upon the public and a shame to ourselves? The sincerity of my desire for the union of these

two great societies will be called into question by no one who remembers that I was the original author of the Savannah invitation. Those resolutions I first submitted to you at the preliminary evening meeting of your general officers and one delegate from each State Society in Boston, April 18, 1895, before your general assembly in Faneuil Hall on the following day; and they failed of adoption at that time because they were presented by an individual delegate, not by a State Society. But, the next year, I was instructed to present those same resolutions to your general assembly at Savannah, April 20, 1896, in the name of the Massachusetts Society; and they were then and there adopted with enthusiasm in a unanimous vote by States. No one who recalls these facts will question my desire for union of the two Societies on terms honorable to both, or doubt that my objections to this constitution grow out of that very desire. If I oppose union on the terms proposed by the majority of this committee, it is because such a union appears to me incompatible with the honor of either society. There may be some here who want union on no terms; there may be others who want union on any terms. But there may be others still who want union on honorable terms alone, and I trust that these, for whom I have tried to act, may prove to be the large majority.

Francis Ellingwood Abbot,
Member of the Committee of
Conference on Basis of Union.

Mr. Lewis (New York): I beg to ask the attention of the Society to the fact that we are going astray from our moorings, and it becomes us to consider where we are.

Why do we sit here? By what right do we occupy seats in this Convention, and what authority have we for any action that we may take? As I understand it, we are here by virtue of a certain document known as the Constitution of the Society of the Sons of the Revolution. Any action which we may take in this meeting must be founded upon that document and in pursuance of its terms; and if we deviate from that in any respect we forfeit our right to have our action accepted by anybody, and it has no authority or significance. This is a fundamental principle which I think no one would dispute.

Now, we are indebted to the gentlemen of the Committee whom we appointed to formulate a plan of union, for their honest and earnest endeavors to accomplish this work, and for the thoughtful and eloquent terms in which they have presented the result, and I shall be second to no one in my cordial acknowledgment of the patriotic spirit which has actuated their labors, and of the earnest work which they have done in the service of this Society. The work which they report to us stands out as a monument of earnest labor, and of the spirit of devotion to the great objects for which our Society is formed, as well as of courtesy and fraternal regard for our friends above who are engaged in the same work with us, and to a large extent committed to the same principles, but they have made us, permit me to say, a report which we in this Convention are utterly powerless to adopt. We are not here as the makers or amenders or supersedes of a constitution; with that work we are not charged; with that authority we are not endowed. The Constitution of the Sons of the Revolution is a compact between certain State Societies. It contains no provision that by a simple vote of this Convention, or of any Convention, its terms can in any respect be modified or changed. I can conceive of nothing more startling, more overwhelming, more revolutionary, more utterly unconstitutional in a deliberative body than an attempt by us, I will not say to overthrow, to supersede, to annul the Constitution under which we are sitting here, but even to amend it in the slightest degree. We cannot do it without appealing to those authorities from whom we derive our rights to sit here, and any action we take here must have its justification. This report provides the Constitution of the Sons of the Revolution shall be disregarded, superseded, passed by, and its place taken by a new Constitution, a draft of which is submitted to us. These gentlemen who have so patriotically and carefully labored in our service at our request are entitled to the most ample and respectful consideration. That consideration must be given to them, but it must be given by those who have power to consider it and act upon it. I, therefore, respectfully move the following resolution as the only solution of the difficulty we find ourselves in today, and the only proper and respectful action which we are enabled to take towards this report:

Whereas, the report submitted by the special committee to devise a plan of union of this Society with the Sons of the American Revolution proposes to supersede the Constitution of this Society, and

Whereas, this Convention has no authority to take final action on such a proposition, therefore

Resolved, that the report of the said committee, together with the report of the minority of said committee on the same subject, are hereby referred for action to the Societies of the Sons of the Revolution in the several States of the Union.

Mr. Charles Henry Jones (Pennsylvania): I rise to second the resolution of Mr. Lewis, of New York.

As he has well stated, the Sons of the Revolution began its existence by the formation of State Societies. They grew from New York to Pennsylvania in that order, and then into Societies in other States. When they had become comparatively numerous the question of forming some sort of general society arose, and these State Societies adopted what is now known as the Constitution of the Society of the Sons of the Revolution. Before that Constitution became operative it was adopted by every Society which it was intended should be bound by it. They acted in their individual capacity, each one of them constituting a distinct corporate entity, and in that Constitution they wrote certain things, and they expressly omitted from that Constitution any power of amendment. They intended that before anything should be added to or taken from that Constitution it should come back and be sanctioned by them. They knew what their rights were. They knew the spirit which had actuated them in forming this Society, and they did not intend to delegate to anybody else the right to judge for them when those purposes or those objects should be changed. Now, when the question of amendment arose in this Society, and it has arisen but once, we all understood this proposition that I am trying to make clear to you. It was a question of adding additional officers as members of the General Society, and it was unanimously admitted in the General Society that that could not be done unless that proposed addition to the Constitution was sent back to each Society; and that it could not become operative

unless each Society should adopt it. That was done. This was an interpretation of the Constitution and of the powers of the General Society, and it forms a precedent by which we are now bound.

Now, Mr. President, take for instance the Society in the State of Pennsylvania, that is a body incorporated under the corporation laws of Pennsylvania. It has a constitution, it has by-laws, adopted in pursuance of those laws. Can you change that? We, sitting here as the delegates of that Society, are not authorized to change it. We simply come here in pursuance of the provisions of that Constitution to act in pursuance of and within the limitations of that Constitution. We have not power to unite with you in changing it. And one of the most fundamental things there, in our way of looking at it, was its clause of eligibility. Are you, sitting here, going to change, for a corporation existing under the laws of Pennsylvania, one of its fundamental constitutional rights like that without its consent? It adopted colors; it adopted insignia, and it adopted a seal and a name. You cannot change them; any lawyer or any layman will tell you that. Look at the corporations you have in the State of Ohio, incorporated under your general corporation law, can anybody but the members of that corporation, or its stockholders, change its fundamental law, or its by-laws? Certainly not.

Mr. Wood: May I ask Mr. Jones one question. Is the National Society of the Sons of the Revolution incorporated?

Mr. Jones: No, sir, it is simply a sort of fraternal gathering under limited terms. I may say, for analogy, as Mr. Lewis has used that term, it was a federation, and it was brought into being by certain granted rights, just like the Constitution of the United States, and all rights not granted were certainly reserved.

Now, Mr. President, this question of union, as Mr. Lewis has said, has always had its difficulties. There has never seemed to be any good reason why there should be two societies having the same object and constituted in the same way, and we have always been considering a plan by which these two societies might be united, but unless we do it in the right way, unless we amend our constitution, in a regular and lawful way, we get nothing. You

cannot disturb the corporate existence, or the corporate constitution, or the corporate principles of all these distinctive State societies running down the Atlantic coast, by any action you may take here, without the consent of each of these societies given at a regular meeting of the members of those societies. These Western Societies, or this meeting of the General Society, cannot change their constitution for them. It is simply impossible for you, gentlemen, to attempt here to adopt this constitution as a finality, and expect it to be binding upon the Society in the State of Pennsylvania. I only have to say to you that it will not be binding upon us unless we adopt it. I cannot speak in that respect for the Pennsylvania Society. I do not know what it may do. It is composed of over a thousand members, and until they meet and act upon this matter as they see fit, no man is authorized to act for them. Its Board of Managers, of which I am one, cannot act for them. This proposed constitution will have to go back to the Pennsylvania Society and be considered by it, as the present constitution was considered. We had another constitution before the present one. I remember distinctly the meeting of the Society at which this, our present constitution, was proposed. I remember how it was discussed, how it was adopted; and by virtue of that act, and the similar action in all the other States, we formed this General Society, which has always been a source of so much pleasure and gratification to all of us. It is better to wait than to go wrong; and you gentlemen who are advocating this (pardon me for saying) revolutionary measure to-day will gain nothing by it. No changes in our present constitution that are not ratified by the members of the Pennsylvania Society in a regular meeting of that Society will be binding upon it.

Mr. Lyon (Illinois): Now it seems to me that one of the fundamental principles of our organization, whether it is expressed in resolutions well drawn up by attorneys or otherwise, is unity; and that being so, anything that intervenes against that is to be condemned by this association if we are honest in our purpose. What is the object of our society? Why are we here? Is it simply to relate, "I had an ancestor in the Revolution," and so and so had ancestors very respectable people, residing in Maryland

or on the eastern shore, on the Susquehanna or the Schuylkill? No; it is for a greater, broader principle. Now, the fundamental principle we stand for, as I understand it, is the bringing together of all the people who can prove a lineal descent from the people who fought in that war, who are entitled to membership here. That is something greater and broader than any technical question, how the Pennsylvania Society was organized, and what powers the Pennsylvania Society may have given its delegates. I have great respect for Pennsylvania myself, but the organization at Harrisburg can never defeat the aims of this Society. I believe that this new constitution which the Committee have brought here covers that great principle; and we are here for uniting with them on that principle, regardless of anything else.

Mr. Wood: This is a very vital question; it goes to the heart of the whole movement. I, with all respect, differ from the opinion of the gentlemen from New York and Pennsylvania; and yet I feel that the action which we may take upon this resolution settles the whole question now and forever. I therefore desire for myself, and I have no doubt others desire, a little time to think about it. It is now twenty minutes after one o'clock, we all of us have been working faithfully and would like a little lunch; I therefore move that the meeting take a recess until three o'clock this afternoon.

Motion seconded.

Mr. Voorhees: (Colorado): This is the first time we have heard so much about the union and so little about the stars and stripes. I ask now that I might present before this body a set of resolutions offered by the State of Colorado, that they may be considered before we adjourn, and I know that the question is a mooted one.

Mr. Wood: The gentleman is not in order. I make a motion to adjourn. The gentleman's remarks are not in order; but in order that he may be in order I withdraw my motion to take a recess, with the understanding that it shall be renewed after the consideration of his resolution.

Mr. Voorhees (Colorado): I know we are trespassing, but on the question of patriotism this Society will never yield the floor to any one. I ask the Secretary to read these resolutions, and that they may be offered for consideration later on.

Mr. Stevens (New Jersey): I rise to a point of order. There is a motion now before this body, a motion offered by Mr. Lewis of New York.

The Chair: The question before the house is the motion of Mr. Lewis seconded by Mr. Jones. It can only be superseded by an amendment to the resolution offered. Do I understand the gentleman to say this is an amendment to this resolution?

Mr. Voorhees: It is not, sir.

The Chair: A motion to adjourn is always in order.

Mr. Wood: I renew my motion to adjourn until three o'clock this afternoon. I understand the Chair to have ruled this out of order.

The Chair: It is not out of order, no, it is not out of order. The motion of the gentleman from Colorado is out of order. The motion is made to adjourn this body for recess until three o'clock.

Motion to adjourn seconded, submitted to vote and carried.

Mr. Wood: I now ask those in favor of union and who met this morning to remain.

An adjournment was here taken to three o'clock, P. M.

---

3 P. M.

Met, pursuant to adjournment.

Mr. Pugh (Ohio): I would like to have the floor a moment before we meet here. The Ohio Society to-night tender you gentlemen, as well as the other gentlemen, a dinner here. It has been impossible to furnish you with your cards from the fact that until half-past twelve we were unable to obtain a list of the delegates.

At six o'clock Mr. Beale will be on the reception floor and issue the cards at that time. If our Convention is through by four o'clock we will have cars to take you on a trolley ride. I have delayed that until our meeting would be finished, as I do not think anybody would stop here in the midst of this very entertaining discussion now before the house. There will be tickets issued to all the delegates, which they will receive on the reception floor this evening. The dinner is to be at 7.30 this evening.

THE CHAIR: The Society will come to order.

JUDGE HARDEN (Georgia): Mr. President, I desire to second, in addition to the seconds already received, the motion made by Mr. Lewis of New York, for the reasons mentioned by him, and for an additional reason which I will now mention here.

You will understand, gentlemen, that we are all of us seriously in earnest in the position which we take, and we believe from our hearts that you are as earnest and as honest as we are, therefore we have nothing in the world to say in the way of criticism, and I will not even attempt to discuss the desirability of the plan which is proposed. You have heard from Mr. Lewis and from the other gentlemen who seconded his motion, as I do now, the most excellent and powerful and cogent reasons why the matter cannot be acted upon by the General Society, why it can be acted upon only by the State Societies in their separate existences, and therefore should be at once referred to them, if anything is to be done in the direction which most of the gentlemen seem to desire.

The other additional reason, which was not mentioned and to which I desire to call your attention, is that, apart from the fact that no corporation has the right to do any act which is not specifically permitted or by necessary inference permitted in its charter, so no creature of those corporations can do more than its creator, the corporation itself; which answers the question asked by my friend, Captain Wood, as to whether or not the General Society was incorporated. It was not, but it is the creature of the State Societies, and is limited to the powers which they could give, and they could not give it powers they did not themselves possess. That additional reason is not only one of law but of common sense. Any layman can understand it. It is not within the power of any

corporation to undertake to do an act which it knows is of itself illegal or impossible; and that is what our friends by their report are undertaking to do. Their report begins: "We are a committee appointed to determine what is the best basis of union—or to determine upon the basis of union of the two societies." Necessarily and naturally, the plan which they propose must be the best plan they could find in their opinion. In their opinion, they seem to have found, what I told them long ago that they would find, that it is impossible for two societies in actual existence to combine as one society except as a third society. Consequently, they say that we propose a third society, to be composed of the members of these two societies; and the members of these two societies shall have the right to wear their insignia, their badges, their rosettes and that of the new society together or separately, as they please. Their continuing to wear them, showing it is their expectation that the new society shall be made up of the old societies, and that the old societies shall continue to exist until they expire by the way provided by law or by nature, like all things. Now, that is what it is. They say, in addition, it shall be composed of members of the two societies, and we hereby declare that all the members who are eligible and desirable—I am not quoting verbatim—of the two societies are members of this society, the Committee neglects to add, if they so desire. I speak but for Georgia; I may say, as I am uninstructed, I speak but for myself, but for the confidence which Georgia has in me—can I, as a member of the Georgia Society, be taken up and transferred bodily into another society, willy-nilly, without being asked "yes" or "no?" How am I to be delivered to the new society? How are the rest of the Georgians to be delivered to the new society? Does not it amount simply to a question, can we be transferred like cattle, can we be driven into the shambles and sold to the highest or the lowest bidder, and then delivered?

There is a story of a man who sold a tiger in the jungle; he got his pay but he never delivered the goods. I do not mean to say that our opposition to this will be of so ferocious a nature as to be properly likened to a tiger, but I do mean to say that we have no right in trying to form this new society to abrogate all the rights which our ancestors succeeded in establishing—the right of freedom,

the right of self-choice, the right to do as you please so long as you do not interfere with anybody else's rights. Can I be put in a new society? Can the Georgia Society be put in a new society? Therefore, you have undertaken to do what you cannot do, what is impossible—not simply impracticable, but impossible, to declare that we, the delegates from a majority of the States, representing the Sons of the Revolution and representing the Sons of the American Revolution shall declare that this constitution is accepted and that it binds us all? Don't you see that it can't be done? Don't you see that it is *ultra vires?* Don't you see that if it were done no good could possibly come of it?—you cannot deliver your goods. Therefore, the resolution of my friend Mr. Lewis is that we do now what we could have done at the beginning, if this thing is not to remain a farce—because I call it a farce when we have met in Savannah and talked and voted, and when we met in Philadelphia and talked and voted, and when we meet in Cincinnati and talk and vote, without any so far practical results, and as I said, you cannot carry this through, there can be no practical results—to begin now where we should have begun, refer the matter to the States. The States are sovereign and independent in themselves. Supposing the States, six, eight, ten or fifteen, refuse to come in, you cannot call upon the naval or military or judicial power of the United States to go and enforce your wishes. It is absolutely *fulmen brutum*, and nothing more, sound and nothing else, thunder without the lightning; therefore, I second the motion of Mr. Lewis.

The Chair: Gentlemen, the question is upon the resolution submitted by Mr. Lewis, of New York. Mr. Wood has the floor.

Mr. Wood: Mr. Chairman, I suppose my friend from Georgia, Judge Harden, and I would not agree upon the rights of State Societies any more than we would agree upon the rights of States. His argument would come with greater force did not I know he was opposed to union under any circumstances whatever.

Judge Harden (Georgia): I rise to a question of privilege. As we entered this portion of the building I was asked: "Are you in favor of union, in favor of union under any circumstances?"

I answered: "I am not now. I was." If I am to be quoted, let me be quoted correctly.

Mr. Wood: I beg to correct my statement then, and to say: "Did I not know Judge Harden was opposed to union now upon any terms."

I differ from my friends, Mr. Jones and Mr. Lewis. I do not believe it is necessary to refer the matter to the States, because the States are represented here in convention. No State Convention has sent a delegate here without knowing what the question was which was to come before this body for decision. No delegation is here without knowing the temper of its State on this question, and I think we are just as well qualified to vote now as after a reference to the State Societies. I wish to state it as my conviction, that the passage of this resolution defeats now and forever the union of the two societies, that a vote in favor of this resolution is a vote that we will continue our distinct and rival positions, striving for the increase of our membership, and keeping out members who will not join because of the rivalry of the Societies—which have no basis of rivalry except increase of membership; their objects are the same; their principles are the same; the qualifications for membership are the same, and there is no reason under God's Heavens, with that ambition for the increase of our membership and the cultivation of patriotism in our Country, without which ambition the existence of the Societies is not justified, why we should not come together and become a great and powerful force, extending from ocean to ocean, and from the Gulf to the Lakes, making our country stronger and letting our young people grow up to be proud citizens of the United States, and of the heritage which has been bequeathed to them by their Revolutionary sires. I say, a vote in the affirmative for this resolution, though it may not, in the judgment of the mover of it, will defeat forever the union of the two societies. I sincerely hope the resolution will not be adopted. (Applause.)

Dr. Rhodes (Minnesota): Mr. President and Gentlemen, I think we have had presented to us two distinct reasons why this resolution that has been offered by the gentleman from New York should not prevail; one of them is based upon a constitutional

difficulty, and the other is based upon what I may call a sentimental objection—not using the word offensively—to the union of these two Societies.

As I understood the argument of the gentlemen from New York, Mr. Lewis, which we are discussing, it was that we are attempting something we have no power at all to perform; that we have no power here to set aside or amend the Constitution of the Sons of the Revolution. Now, if that be true, there is no necessity of our further discussing this question at all. If the Constitution of the Sons of the Revolution under which we act, under which we are constituted, is such that we cannot make any change in it, or make any sort of alteration in it at all, either here or anywhere else, as the gentleman seems to suggest, then of course such a radical action as we propose, and of course any less radical action, cannot be taken; but I submit that the very argument of the gentleman himself was such as would show him if he would look at it that certainly he has not quoted correctly the position we occupied toward the Constitution of the General Society of the Sons of the Revolution. This Constitution, which is our organic law, which was adopted by the Societies of the different States, was adopted by them without any section for its revision whatever; that is, they did not add to it any article which imposed bounds, restrictions or safe-guards upon what were originally the conditions under which it enacted them. The same powers that created the Constitution reserved to themselves the power to change it or abrogate it, whenever they saw fit. At the end of every constitutional agreement or instrument there is the general provision that that constitution can by a vote of two-thirds of the order or the submission of it to the chapters of the different organizations be changed. There is none such in our constitution whatever. The same power that created the constitution may abrogate it at any moment whatever. In the constitution of the Society of New York, for instance, they added at the close of the constitution a provision that there shall be no alteration or amendment of the constitution of this society unless notice is duly given in writing, signed by the member presenting the same, at a meeting of the society, nor until thirty days after said notice, by a vote of three-fourths of the members present. In the Constitution of the United States they

stipulated the authority and method by which it must be changed. There is no appendage or article in this constitution of this society on the subject of amendments. There was an attempt made to add one. "The following amendment was proposed in 1893, and will be voted on at the next regular meeting." This appears from the New York Society's book: "This constitution may be amended at any meeting of the Society by a vote of three-fourths of the members present, provided notice of such proposed amendment shall be given at a previous meeting or communicated to each State Society thirty days before action is had thereon."

It is proposed by Mr. Woodruff, of New York, and seconded by Mr. Hall, of Maryland, but it has never been acted upon and never passed into the constitution, and we are left with the same power which created the constitution. It is competent for us, the duly accredited representatives of the different State societies, to entirely cancel and abrogate the Constitution by our vote to-day and substitute in its place some other, because there is no limit or restriction to so doing.

More than that, the gentleman preceding went on to say, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that if we proceed to this action to-day, do you suppose it to be binding upon the Pennsylvania society? And the gentleman from Georgia asks, could we undertake to transfer their society bodily into another society? I say to him we can; I say it is so nominated in the bond, that we can do so, and that constitution gives us the right. In the constitution by which we are restricted, we are given the right to change our own name, and we have provided that the State societies shall be bound by the action of the General Council of the Sons of the Revolution. State societies shall regulate all matters respecting their own affairs, consistent with the general good of the societies. Judge of the qualification of their members or those proposed for membership, subject, however, to the provisions of this constitution. There is reserved the sovereign power, enabling us to dictate to the States exactly who shall be their members and who shall not be their members. We have, by the exercise of that power by this body here to-day, the right to say to the State Society of Pennsylvania or Georgia, that in our wisdom we see fit to change this constitution and incorporate with the members of the

Society of the American Revolution. They are bound by our action. It is not a question of States rights or any other rights. It is simply a question of whether we are bound by the instrument which binds us organically together as Sons of the Revolution. So much for the proposition that we have no constitutional right. Whether these societies will be bound by our actions is the old question whether the right of secession obtains. The constitution binds them as it has bound us.

Now, as to the sentimental, using that word again, that I may be explicit, not offensively, turning to the minority report, where the opposition is not so much a constitutional one but one of sentiment, as to insignia, names and minor details, I cannot believe my brethren Sons of the Revolution, that we have come up here in the year 1897 to be swerved aside from our high and great purpose of presenting one front by undertaking to set aside this proposed union of two great societies constituting nearly 25,000 sons of sires of the Revolutionary War on such a frivolous pretence as is presented in the minority report. I do not use the word frivolous in an offensive sense at all. I yield implicit adherence to a large part of the sentiment given in Mr. Abbot's report, but are we simply to allow our deliberations to come to naught, by the discussing of our insignia and the name by which we shall be known, when this grand society of the Sons of the American Revolution can meet this morning, representing three times as many members as we have, a society antedating our own—

Voices: That is a mistake.

Mr. Rhodes: Let me withdraw that then. That Society, the Sons of the American Revolution, representing a large constituency and having as much a title to represent the lineal sons of the sires of the Revolution as we have ourselves, can unanimously stand up and vote, and have voted with one voice, to sacrifice all we are asked to sacrifice, and give up, they can give up their name and insignia, if they can do that without one voice of protest, unanimously standing, gentlemen, is there not enough of the old spirit which bound together the federal sires of the Revolution in Georgia, Maryland and Virginia, in us to cause us to sink all our differences and enable us to stand up with them? In God's

name we will not allow frivolous pretexts to stand between us and the consummation of that which is in all our hearts.

I yield to no man in my fidelity to the Sons of the Revolution. I am not a member of the Sons of the American Revolution. I am not a Son of the Colonial War. I trace my ancestry to one whom I revere, the general in chief of the armies of the colonies at the time when General Washington came from Virginia to supersede him in the command of all the troops, and in the spirit in which that general acted I should count myself base to my allegiance to the Sons of Revolutionary sires to ask of the Sons of the American Revolution anything more than we are willing to concede ourselves. And there is nothing I am not willing to concede. If we can go out from under this roof as one single army inspired with one single purpose and in the decadent civilization to show one body where is embodied the virtues of our forefathers, and that we may transmit the spirit of the men from Maine to Georgia who stood together, without any of the disintegrating jealousies which attacked even the mighty Washington himself.

Are we worthy of our ancestors, do we share their spirit, do we inherit any of their real spirit, if we go out to the American people and say the Sons of the American Revolution one by one stood up to-day and were counted for a great united society, and that the Sons of the Revolution meeting failed to agree and that they are issuing from it, broken, discordant and vindictive in their spirit.

Now, gentlemen, on the ground of constitutional law, we have a right to adopt this constitution; on the ground of expediency it is our moral duty; on the ground of higher emotions, as patriotic men, we should sink all feelings of mere personal vindictiveness of those matters, and, standing shoulder to shoulder, say: "We have not much to give, but what we have to give we give gladly, that we may stand together with you in this great cause." (Applause.)

Now, if I could only think I had made any converts by what I have said I should think my speech was more than I thought I could make.

It is understood, the Sons of the American Revolution in their adoption of this proposed union, do not intend that it shall be

binding immediately. They propose that it must go to the State Societies, and there it shall be ratified by a majority of their State Societies. I understand that is what we shall do here, that we do not undertake to force—I doubt if there is a majority—I speak frankly, I am no politician—I doubt whether there is a majority upon this floor to carry this proposed Constitution; and whether it should by vote be forced upon a State Society contrary to its desire. I should think we should adopt it as the Sons of the American Revolution did and send it back to the States. All these things that have been made so much of in the minority report, descent, insignia and name, as to that they will satisfy us all. The spirit of sacrifice will beget the spirit of obliging each other in such a matter as this, and let us submit the matter to these State Societies and we shall then have the power to come together, and it is with that understanding that I shall vote to-day.

I shall cast my vote that we adopt the report of this committee just as it is word for word without a change, because change makes delay. I would then have it certified to the different States, and have them notified to take their action upon it, and have that action transmitted to us when we for the Sons, and the Sons of the American Revolution may consummate the union, and if the majority of the States do not ratify it then I think it should then fail.

I think it is the fair, courteous and proper way. Let us adopt the report to-day, let us adopt it unanimously to-day as showing our spirit, and then submit it to our State Societies, and each one of them shall argue it upon its own floor. I hope and pray that for the interest of this society of which I am a member I shall not have to go to inquiring friends and say that while the Sons of the American Revolution were guided by a spirit of unity and hope, we wrangled and separated, disagreeing on little questions, making nothing whatever for the mighty argument for which we have all come together. (Applause).

Judge Harden: Will you allow me to ask the gentleman what is his construction of the Ninth Article of the Constitution?

Mr. Pugh: Mr. Chairman, there is waiting outside a committee

from the Sons of the American Revolution. What is the pleasure of the house?

Mr. Rukard Hurd (Minnesota): I move the Committee be received.

Motion seconded, put to vote and carried.

The committee appears.

Mr. Whitehead (Sons of the American Revolution): Mr. President, and members of the Sons of the Revolution, I appear before you on behalf of the Sons of the American Revolution, with my fellows here, a Committee appointed for the purpose of announcing to you a certain fact which I hope will meet with your concurrence and will also meet with your approbation.

In the month of April last, at your annual congress assembled in Philadelphia, you presented an overture to the Sons of the American Revolution looking with a very friendly spirit toward the consummation of the union which has long been a desirable matter with us, and I hope a desirable matter with you. You appointed a Committee to formulate a plan of union in connection with a like Committee to be appointed by the Sons of the American Revolution. Permeated by the same spirit, which we have no doubt actuated you, Mr. Chairman, we appointed a like Committee. These two Committees have met during the last summer and they have formulated the plan of union presented by the report, and that formulation and that constitution was the unanimous report of the two joint committees.

Following your kind and friendly overture, acting properly, acting also promptly upon the report of the two committees, we, the Sons of the American Revolution, have adopted the plan of union proposed by the joint committee, and accepted the constitution which they have presented; but it will need, according to the last article of that constitution, that it should be passed upon by the joint congress of the two associations. We are ready now, and we hope that the same spirit which actuates us in presenting ourselves will impel you to meet us and proceed to the purposes which have called us together. The members of our Association and the members of your Association have come together at much

expense of time and money from their homes and business, actuated by one single purpose—for the union between these two societies. Let that union be consummated to-day, and the result will be the formation of the grandest, the noblest, and the best patriotic society that the world ever saw (applause). It will give strength and force to the patriotism of those descended from our fathers. It will give strength and force to us as we go out in the world to battle for the great interests of which we are so proud.

I present my congratulations to you for meeting together upon this momentous occasion, and we invite you to meet with us.

Mr. Horace Kent Tenney (Illinois): Before these gentlemen meet together, I wish to make a suggestion, it may be held to be somewhat technical, and may be held to be not in order, but still it will assist us in our deliberations here. One of the questions which has been brought forward with considerable power by a great many persons is the question of the revision of the rolls of these two societies; and the question whether one or both of these societies were willing to submit to an examination of their rolls and the question of the eligibility of their members of the societies to which they now belong.

I desire to say that I have as a member of this Committee from time to time conferred with some gentlemen in the other Society, particularly with Mr. Richardson, who is the Chairman of their Committee. That if he is willing and the gentlemen of our Society are willing I should be personally very glad if he would say to us here for the purpose of assisting us in these patriotic deliberations something with reference to the question of whether or not his Society is willing to have us adopt this constitution and to have us still after that is done provide for the revision of the rolls, the examination of the qualifications of members of the two societies, and to consummate, if we may do it to-day, this union which we so much desire, but at the same time to set at rest by a subsequent examination every cavil that can be made against the membership of these societies.

Mr. Richardson (Sons of the American Revolution): I thank the gentleman, Mr. President, for his suggestion, which was in my mind. I was instructed by the Committee to present our views

upon this subject with a view of having the matter of union accomplished, and everything else may be settled afterwards. I say to you on behalf of the Sons of the American Revolution, Mr. President, and to the members of the Sons of the Revolution, that we are not only willing but anxious to subject our membership to such proper revision as may be contemplated and carried out by you. Joint Committees were appointed for the purpose of revising those rolls, but when that Committee was appointed it was too late to do so. I had a personal friend who was appointed on it, and he announced to me that it would be impossible to do it. You have the rolls. You may have all our certificates of membership. You may have them. We will give you everything we have on the subject fairly and fully. What we want, Mr. President and gentlemen, is the union of these two Societies, based upon a common spirit, love of country, actuated by the same spirit which sent our fathers to battle, that principle actuates us, and we know that it actuates you. (Applause). That is all that we have to say.

(The Committee from the Society of Sons of the American Revolution retires.)

Mr. Charles Henry Jones (Pennsylvania): I ask Mr. Lewis' permission, and I ask the gentleman who last addressed the Society, Dr. Rhodes, what construction he puts on the ninth article. He informs me that that article would have to be amended, so as to provide that this union could only take place after it had been ratified by the State Societies.

Dr. Rhodes (Minnesota): That is only my personal interpretation. I will say to Mr. Lewis that I am going to offer, after you have spoken, a resolution, and I give you notice of it now. To expedite matters, I am going to move that your resolution be laid upon the table and that we proceed to vote upon the general question before us.

Mr. Lewis (New York): There is nothing like candid discussion to bring us nearer together. The remarks of our friend on the left in advocacy of the report of the Committee have come very near to bringing us upon common ground. If I understand him cor-

rectly, the action of the Sons of the American Revolution in adopting the report of the Committee is subject to approval by the several State Societies of that organization.

Dr. Rhodes (Minnesota): That was my statement upon the authority of one of their members.

Mr. Lewis (New York): Having studied carefully our own constitution, I am compelled, in conscience and in honor, to call your attention to the fact that our constitution, precisely as our friend has said, having provided in itself no method of amendment, remands the power of amendment, and of course in still higher degree, and by a still stronger necessity the question of the power of superseding it to the same authority which created the constitution. We agree upon that point. It has been affirmed most positively by my friend, and I can add nothing to the words in which he stated it. That the power which created the constitution of the Sons of the Revolution is the power which can amend or even supersede it. The only question upon which we now disagree is apparently a superficial one when it is explained. What was the power which created the Sons of the Revolution? If you look into the history of it you will find that that constitution was promulgated, formed and proposed by the delegates of the several States in their conventions, and that it went into force upon the adoption and ratification by each of the several States which entered into the organization. That is the history of it, about which there is no question, with which we are all familiar. Now, if we supersede this constitution by another, or if we amend it in any respect, we have a perfect right to formulate that amendment; we have a perfect right to appoint a committee, as we have appointed this committee, one with power to frame a desirable amendment or to offer a substitute for our constitution, and we have a right to adopt the report of the committee so far as the power of this convention is concerned, and to recommend to the State Societies the adoption by them and by each of them, of that constitution, but having done that it is perfectly plain to every one who knows the elements of constitutional law that we have exhausted our powers; and the idea that this convention and these delegates without any power under the written constitution, without any power conferred upon them,

have power now to attempt to undo the work which was done by the several State organizations, each in its individual capacity, by the abrogation of this constitution and the substitution of another is to my mind, in law, a monstrous proposition, one that certainly will not commend itself on reflection to the clear mind of my friend on the left.

Now we are coming upon common ground. The stirring words which we have heard from our friends whom we love, they have stirred our blood to the depths, and I venture to say that there is not one of us here who would not be rejoiced to-day if we as one united body could go forth before the freemen of our land as representing alone and together the sires of the Revolution from whom we are proud to derive our descent. But what we do must be done in honor to our trust. We are here entrusted with power to a limited extent. We cannot betray our trust. We cannot transcend the limits of our commissions. We cannot go one step beyond. To the utmost limit of that commission I am prepared to go hand in hand with all my brethren. I believe that the moral effect of that which we do here will be infinitely greater, the effect will be far more satisfactory if we confine ourselves within our specified powers and rights granted us by those who have constituted us their delegates than if we transcend our powers. We must respect our constitution, not trample on it. Can we, as my friend has already told us, as he clearly admits in his remarks, can we adopt that report as it stands, and attempt to put it into force in the face of that last section? By so doing we should have trampled upon our constitution, we should have defied our constitution, and we should have constituted ourselves rebels and seceders from the trust which they who sent us here sent us to defend and preserve.

Mr. Hurd (Minnesota): I desire to announce officially as a delegate that our Society has passed several votes in favor of union. Our Society shall vote for union. I announce that officially. There may be others.

Delegates announce that Kentucky, Illinois, and Michigan have similarly voted.

Dr. Rhodes (Minnesota): I now make a motion that the resolution which we are discussing of the gentleman from New York be now laid upon the table, and that we may proceed to vote upon the majority and minority reports.

Mr. Joshua W. Caldwell (Tennessee): Mr. President and gentlemen, there is a view, in my opinion, which should be presented, and presented frankly. I represent the State of Tennessee. A Society which has heretofore taken no part in the deliberations of the General Society upon this question, and which has not heretofore been definitely committed to either side. I should say in the first place, in order to be perfectly frank, that we are generally in favor of the proposition contained in the resolution presented by the gentleman from New York. But there are certain other things which impress us upon coming here, and we occupy, Mr. President, to a certain extent, an unusual position. This matter is all new to us, and there are aspects to it which are painful to us, which are perhaps not so apparent to the rest of you.

I will say in the first place that we are not fully persuaded either of the absolute necessity, or of the unquestionable expediency of union (Applause). We are not sure that two competing societies, each exercising a generous and patriotic emulation, may not do more good than one large society. It is unpleasant to say these things in view of the very pleasant speech made by my friend from Massachusetts, but I say we are not thoroughly convinced that it is expedient.

Again we are told that unity and harmony must be had. But, gentlemen, so far as harmony is concerned, the very elaborate courtesies which have passed between the two societies ought to convince most of us that we can be separate and yet harmonious. I repeat that while unity of purpose may be necessary, I cannot conceive that unity of organization is absolutely necessary.

Now, coming further, as a matter of sentiment, the Tennessee Society is perfectly willing to have the union if we can have it upon a proper basis and under proper conditions for our Society. But we do not think that union is so important that our own Society should be disrupted in order to have union; that is our position, but in that we defer to those of you who are older

societies. We come here and find that this Society is separated into two distinct parties, two different factions. We view with consternation the fact of jealousies which seem to be irreconcilable, and we see methods almost political. I don't say this as criticising anybody. I would not venture to criticise any one. My attitude is one of apprehension, not of reprehension. I repeat, we view it with consternation and regret, and it seems to me, speaking from the point of view of a comparative outsider, for that is really our attitude up to the present time, that we are really confronted by this question: Not shall we have unity by uniting the two Societies, but shall we continue to have two Societies, one the Sons of the American Revolution and the other the Sons of the Revolution, or shall we have two societies, one made up of the Sons of the American Revolution and a part of the Sons of the Revolution, and another of the remnant of the Sons of the Revolution. Now, as an outsider, I say that is the way the matter presents itself to me, not that I advocate any such thing. We are all perfectly willing to have the majority adopt any proper basis, but it seems to me we are confronted with the question whether or not we will divide our Society into two parts. We do not believe we ought to go that far. We do not believe that union ought to be had at such a cost.

I say for myself, if I had discovered that there was a very serious dissension here I would cast my vote against union. When I came I discovered two irreconcilable factions, and I see the evidences of that spirit in this room and outside of this room, and I am bound to believe that my duty to this Society, to which I owe my allegiance, is to cast my vote against this effort for union.

This is the position, Mr. President, that the Tennessee Society occupies upon this question.

I desire to say this one thing further, and I trust I have not said anything that is at all calculated to stir up strife, I have endeavored to say what I had to say without giving offence. But if I had the determination of this question, which, however, I have not, I, but for my respect, and but for the respect for the overwhelming sentiment, I would say that it is not expedient for us to consider this question any longer. Our deliberations appear to have been taken up with it for four years, so that we have become

Sons of the Revolution for and Sons of the Revolution not for amalgamation, and I believe we have added nothing to it to-day. I believe we will promote the interests of this Society by saying to our friends that we return their most cordial greetings, but that we do not deem it expedient to consider this question further.

Mr. Stevens (New Jersey): I do not rise to make a speech, but to ask the gentleman upon my left to withdraw his motion and allow me to move the question so the debate will be ended, and then take a fair and square vote upon the resolution of Mr. Lewis, and if that resolution be defeated, I am sure there will be no factious debate on the adoption of the majority report.

Motion by Dr. Rhodes to lay resolution of Mr. Lewis on the table withdrawn.

Various delegates seconded the resolution adopting the report of the majority of the Conference Committee.

The Chair: The question is on the resolution offered by Mr. Lewis of New York.

At the request of various members Mr. Lewis read his resolution, as follows:

"Whereas, the report submitted by the Special Committee to devise a plan of union of this Society with the Sons of the American Revolution proposes to supersede the Constitution of this Society; and

"Whereas, this convention has no authority to take final action on such a proposition; therefore,

"*Resolved*, That the report of the said Committee, together with the report of the minority of said Committee on the same subject, are hereby referred for action to the Societies of the Sons of the Revolution in the several States of the Union."

The Secretary now proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ———————— (Illinois): Mr. Chairman, before announcing the vote of Illinois, I would like to ask if we vote for the motion, for the constitution presented to us by the Committee if they will pledge themselves that they will offer an amendment requiring the continued service of the Committee on Revision, and

if they will see to it that all the members of collateral descent are eliminated from the organization, that being true, that will enable us to vote no to this resolution.

JUDGE HARDEN (Georgia): I rise to a question of order.

The proposition of this gentleman is, that under his instructions from his constituents, he could not vote upon this constitution, that is the constitution as it now stands, but he has said that assurances have been made to him—

MR. WOOD (Ohio): I rise to a question of order.

THE CHAIR: The debate is out of order. The Chair would state, the gentlemen rises to explain his vote. He has a right to explain his vote in any manner he thinks fit, and he has voted in accordance with his explanation, and he has voted no and the Chair considers that a correct vote.

JUDGE HARDEN (Georgia): He votes on an impossibility.

THE CHAIR: That is for the gentleman to decide.

The call of the roll resulted as follows:

Carroll, G. P.....Yes.	Vroom, G. V. P.....Yes.
Screven, 2 G. V. P.....—	Montgomery, G. S.....Yes.
Harris, A. G. S.....Yes.	Cadwalader, G. T.....Yes.
Cadle, A. G. T.....No.	Whipple, G. C.....—
Abbot, G. R.....Yes.	Hunt, G. H.....No.

Alabama.....—	California.....Yes.
Colorado.....No.	Connecticut.....—
District of Columbia.....No.	Florida.....—
Georgia.....Yes.	Illinois.....No.
Indiana.....No.	Iowa.....No.
Kentucky.....No.	Maryland.....Yes.
Massachusetts.....Yes.	Michigan.....No.
Minnesota.....No.	Missouri.....No.
Montana.....No.	New Hampshire.....No.
New Jersey.....Yes.	New York.....Yes.
North Carolina.....—	North Dakota.....—

Ohio.....No.	Pennsylvania.....Yes.
Rhode Island.....—	South Carolina.....—
Tennessee.....Yes.	Texas.....No.
Virginia.....Yes.	West Virginia.....No.
Washington.....—	

Mr. Harris: The count of the vote, sir, results in ayes 15, noes 16.

The Chair: The resolutions are not adopted.

Mr. Beale (District of Columbia): I move you, sir, the amendment of the Constitution as proposed by the report of the Joint Committee which has been agreed upon by the Joint Committees by inserting at the end of Section 2 of Article 3 the following words: "Subject, however, to the approval of the Joint Committee of Revision of Membership Rolls." So that Section 2 will then read: "That every member of the Society of the Sons of the Revolution and of the Society of the Sons of the American Revolution in good standing at the time of the adoption of this constitution who has been admitted to either of these Societies under their respective constitutions and the by-laws of their respective national societies shall be enrolled as a member of this Society, 'subject, however, to the approval of the Joint Committee on Revision of Membership Rolls.'"

Dr. Rhodes (Minnesota): I second the amendment.

Mr. Jones (Pennsylvania): Before proceeding to the consideration of this constitution I desire to say that the Pennsylvania Delegation feel that the Pennsylvania Society is not bound by the action of this convention.

Mr. Lewis (New York): Mr. President, I beg to say in behalf of the New York Delegation that we regard ourselves as bound by every act of this convention within the limits of its constitutional powers, and we feel it our duty in case this convention should proceed with the revision and amendment of this report and any action upon it to remain and take such part as we may see fit, but with this distinct understanding: that any action that may be

taken by this body looking to a change of the constitution of the Sons of the Revolution of New York is regarded as a recommendation to the State Societies only.

Dr. Rhodes (Minnesota): I rise to a point of order. There is a motion before the house. These statements made by these different gentlemen are out of order. There is a motion made to amend Section 2 of Article 3, which was introduced by Mr. Beale and seconded by me, and is now before the house.

The Chair: The gentleman is quite right, but the Chair as a matter of courtesy thought it better to allow these gentlemen to make their statements before the house had voted on the matter.

Mr. Stevens (New Jersey): Mr. President, it seems to me it is a question of high privilege.

The Chair: That is the way that the Chair looks at it.

Mr. Stevens (New Jersey): I wish to say on behalf of the New Jersey Delegation that they will return home and report your action, whatever it may be, and will be governed entirely by whatever their Society will tell them to do.

Mr. Wilson (Maryland): I wish to say on behalf of Maryland, that we concur thoroughly with what the gentleman from New Jersey has just said. That we shall report your action to our Society and take their instructions, and take instructions from no one else.

Mr. Wood (Ohio): I rise to a question of privilege. Do I understand these gentlemen to say that they do not propose to be bound by the action of this Convention, and to still attempt to control that action by their votes? Do they propose to vote upon the questions which may come up, upon which they distinctly announce they will not be bound?

Judge Harden (Georgia): I will answer on behalf of Georgia, if I am permitted to do so. Georgia has an idea which has been defended upon the floor to-day that there are certain things which the General Society cannot do. When these things are proposed to be done, Georgia gives her reasons and votes against them, and

if they are done, and in the opinion of Georgia they are ultra vires of the Society, and beyond its powers Georgia will not be bound thereby. That is to say, she will endeavor to stop a manifestly, clearly illegal and unconstitutional act, but if she cannot stop it we will not be bound by it.

Mr. Abbot (Massachusetts): On behalf of Massachusetts, I think it better to say that she takes the same view of the matter. If this action is beyond the power of the Society, we can only refer back to the State Society for its approval. I do not assume to say whether it is or not.

Dr. Robins (Virginia): Virginia takes the same ground.

The Chair: The question is upon the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Washington, Mr. Beale. The amendment is offered and seconded, that Section 2 of Article III of the proposed constitution, as reported by the Committee, be amended—

Mr. Beale (District of Columbia): By inserting at the end of Section 2 the following words: "Subject, however, to the approval of the Joint Committee on Revision of Membership Roll."

The Chair: The question is upon the amendment submitted by the gentleman from the District of Columbia. If there is no objection heard the vote will be taken *viva voce.*

Submitted to vote and carried.

Dr. Rhodes (Minnesota): I move the previous question on the adoption of the majority report of the Conference Committee on Amalgamation of the two Societies.

Mr. Griffith (New Jersey): The motion of the gentleman from New York, Mr. Lewis, which was voted upon—I desire to offer a motion identical in language with the motion which was offered by the gentleman from New York with the change of a single word. If in order, I desire to offer now a motion identical in language with that offered by Mr. Lewis a few moments ago, or if not identical in language, I will simply change two words which will not alter its intent.

The Chair: The motion is in order if the gentlemen will reduce it to writing.

Mr. Griffith (New Jersey): "Whereas the 'amended' report." The one word "amended" is added to Mr. Lewis's motion. That is the only addition. It is not his motion. "Whereas the amended report submitted by the special committee to devise a plan of union of this Society with the Sons of the American Revolution purposes to supersede the constitution of this Society: and

Whereas, this convention has no authority to take final action upon such a proposition: therefore,

Resolved, that the report of the said Committee, together with the report of the minority of said Committee, on the same subject are hereby referred for action to the Societies of the Sons of the Revolution in the several states of the Union.

Mr. Stevens (New Jersey): I rise to a point of order, that the gentlemen is out of order, a question being before the house.

The Chair: The question is on the previous question.

Mr. Wood (Ohio): I rather think, if the Chair will pardon me for saying so, that in the confusion of the different questions—will the Chair settle the question before us?

The Chair: The previous question is called for upon the adoption of the report, and that would practically cut off all debate if adopted.

Judge Harden (Georgia): In the meantime, what would become of the Ninth Article?

The Chair: That would cut off the motion for the previous question which was decided upon. The question is now whether the previous question should be put. Those in favor of the roll call—

Dr. Rhodes (Minnesota): The question that I moved, the previous question, was simply the question whether we shall proceed to vote upon the original report of the Committee. If you vote aye, you vote to take it up, you do not necessarily vote in favor of the adoption of the report of the Committee. It does not commit you to an aye vote upon the adoption of the report.

Mr. Lewis (New York): If it is agreed by all parties that Article Nine will be omitted, its omission will cut off considerable debate. The moving of the previous question would cut off all opportunity for debating the recommendations of the Committee in any way, I therefore beg to object.

Dr. Rhodes (Minnesota): I only want to say what I individually stated, I qualified it and stated I should vote "no" personally. I think the Ninth Article should not be binding upon the council. I cannot speak for the rest of the body.

Mr. Jones (Pennsylvania): Can you speak for Minnesota?

Mr. Rhodes (Minnesota): I speak only for myself. I should like to say that I shall make a motion that Article 9 of the Constitution be excepted and the rest of the constitution acted on.

The Chair: The Chair would state that the gentlemen cannot make that motion if the previous question is adopted.

Mr. Lewis (New York): May I ask the unanimous consent of this body, if I could have the unanimous consent of this body I would take the liberty of making that motion that Article 9 of the report be stricken out. Then we can proceed to act upon the report of the majority of the Committee, and I shall have no objection to the previous question.

Dr. Rhodes (Minnesota): I think we should be perfectly frank with each other. We gain nothing if we are not so. I will say candidly that I have been somewhat disturbed by the speeches made since the vote was taken upon the motion by the gentleman from New York. I came here prepared to stand by any decision this council reached. I would have been satisfied, and out of my lips would never have come the statement that Minnesota would come here and refuse to be bound by the action of the Society, but I am convinced in the little time that I have had given me to consider this matter over since those speeches were made that perhaps there is some truth in their position, and that instead of insisting on haste we perhaps had better move slowly, and I think that it would be well for us to have a unanimous statement this

afternoon from this body that we will all adopt this majority report without that Ninth Article, and each one of us report to our State Societies what has been done by the Sons of the Revolution, and to come back with a united front and then amalgamate. I am not clear but that is the best thing for us to do. I will second the motion that the gentleman has made, and ask the unanimous consent of this body that the Article Ninth, which puts this matter into effect at once, be suspended and removed from this discussion before the previous question is put, and that we all will be free and untrammeled, with the hope that they will submit this matter to their State Societies. Because I simply want to say, gentlemen, I doubt if these gentlemen are able to represent their Societies. I do not believe that the gentlemen from the State of Maryland, or the gentlemen from the State of Tennessee are able to say positively that under the instructions they have from their State Societies they have voted without a split, and without a dissent. I want to say for the State of Minnesota, to the Chair, that I would not do anything that she has not entrusted me to do. I think perhaps the feeling of defeat may have accentuated some of their statements in this matter, but in a spirit of harmony I am willing, against the protests of my friends, to ask unanimous consent that the binding Article Ninth be omitted from this discussion for the present time, and that the vote be taken upon the remaining articles of the Constitution.

Mr. Wilson (Maryland): I rise to a question of privilege. I do not say that the State Society would do as I said, but I consider it my duty to refer the matter to it. They have instructed me, and I will not act without, or beyond, their instructions. I do not think it would be proper.

The Chair: The motion is made that unanimous consent be given to strike out Article Nine.

Mr. Lyon (Illinois): I object on behalf of the State of Illinois.

Dr. Rhodes (Minnesota): I make the motion that Article Ninth be excepted from this discussion, and I withdraw my motion for the previous question.

MR. JONES (Pennsylvania): Wouldn't it be well to move to amend that by inserting in lieu thereof "to strike out the last four words"?

MR. PUGH (Ohio): Isn't this out of order? The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Lyon, having objected, unanimous consent cannot be had.

MR. WOOD (Ohio): He cannot withdraw it without the consent of the body.

THE CHAIR: He can withdraw any motion.

MR. WOOD (Ohio): I think a motion once made and seconded is in the possession of the body, and cannot be withdrawn without the vote of that body.

THE CHAIR: Then the question is on the previous question. Shall the previous question be called? The previous question is that this matter shall come up for the decision of the house, and there can be no debate or amendment.

The roll call on Dr. Rhodes' motion for the previous question resulted as follows:

Carroll, G. P	No.	Vroom, G. V. P	No.
Screven, 2 G. V. P	—	Harris, A. G. S	No.
Montgomery, G. S	No.	Cadle, A. G. T	Yes.
Cadwalader, G. T	No.	Abbot, G. R	No.
Whipple, G. C	—	Hunt, G. H	Yes.
Alabama	—	California	No.
Colorado	Yes.	Connecticut	—
District of Columbia	Yes.	Florida	—
Georgia	No.	Illinois	Yes.
Indiana	No.	Iowa	Yes.
Kentucky	Yes.	Maryland	No.
Massachusetts	No.	Michigan	Yes.
Minnesota	Yes.	Missouri	Yes.
Montana	Yes.	New Hampshire	Yes.
New Jersey	No.	New York	No.
North Carolina	—	North Dakota	—

Ohio.....Yes.	Pennsylvania.....No.
Rhode Island.....—	South Carolina..... .....—
Tennessee.....No.	Texas.....Yes.
Virginia.....No.	West Virginia.....Yes.
Washington.. .....—	

Mr. Harris: Mr. Chairman, there were fifteen affirmative votes and sixteen negative votes.

The Chair: The motion for the previous question therefore is lost. The question now is upon the amendment.

Mr. Lewis (New York): Cordially thanking the Society for the refusal to apply gag law in this matter, I beg to move that Article IX of the proposed constitution be cancelled.

Dr. Rhodes (Minnesota): Wouldn't it meet the gentleman's wishes if the IXth Article be amended so it shall read "This constitution shall take effect when ratified by a majority of the States of each national society. So if we cannot get a majority of the State societies for this purpose, we do not want to adopt it, or limit it to a majority of the State societies of the Sons of the Revolution, so far as the action of the Sons of the Revolution is concerned in the matter. "This constitution shall take effect when ratified by a majority of the State societies of the Sons of the Revolution." I make that motion, Mr. President.

Mr. Lewis (New York): I beg to point out that that motion is objectionable solely because we have no right to pass it. It is not for us here to define a new method by which the constitutions of our societies shall be amended or done away with. We are not here for that purpose. What we are proposing now, the majority of this convention are proposing to the State organizations, is to enter into a new organization. The proper form, therefore, is one which will leave it with each State organization to act for itself, and then if we adopt it, to recommend this constitution to the States. Then it will take effect when the States shall adopt it in each State at the time that they adopt it, but it will not take effect in any State that does not adopt it, because it happens that a majority of the States have already adopted it. It is simply a legal point I raise,

and that is an unquestioned point in constitutional law. Therefore it is preferable that the article be stricken out or that it shall simply declare that it shall take effect in each State when adopted by that State.

Dr. Rhodes (Minnesota): I have gone very far in the spirit of concession. I had hoped that this action would open our way to united and general consent. It is customary when there is no provision made for the amendment of a constitution to amend it by general action, certify it to the different chapters, and it shall specify that the constitutional change shall take effect when a majority of the constituent bodies represented therein have assented to its action, and that is the resolution I offer now. It is certainly clear if we can not get a majority of the Societies it is not adopted. If we do get a majority of the States it should be adopted.

I make this motion with the hope that there will be no discussion upon it.

Judge Harden (Georgia): Allow me to say one word. My learned friend seems to be so enthusiastic in his desire to reach a particular end that he actually, as it seems to me, does not consider the means, even though they may involve a question of right or wrong. He speaks of technical points. Among the technical points he mentions was whether we had the constitutional power, or whether we had the power in law under this present constitution, which is similar in its inception to that by which the United States is now governed, and which all patriotic men must admire not only in its present condition, but in its incipiency. The thirteen States called their convention and they sent delegates to that convention for the purpose of establishing a constitution for the government of the thirteen States represented by their delegates. They met, and they promulgated a constitution, and said this constitution shall take effect when ratified by nine of the thirteen, but only so far as concerns those who ratify it. They recognized a principle that is as eternal as God himself, that no State has got the right to regulate another. The thirteen States could, by a majority vote, adopt a constitution which would affect that majority, but they could not touch the others until they ratified it themselves.

Now then, have we, because, we desire to have a union, which might be a blessing or which might be a curse, and I think honestly now the latter, shall we arrogate to ourselves constitutional powers greater than the constitutional convention of 1786, and undertake to say that if Georgia and a lot of other States choose to adopt this constitution that South Carolina and North Carolina must follow suit. That is the reason I object to it. I do not think it is a technicality. I do not think it is a frivolity. I do not think these propositions can be controverted.

THE CHAIR: The question is upon the motion to strike out the whole of Article Ninth.

The roll call resulted as follows:

LEWIS' MOTION TO STRIKE OUT ARTICLE IX.

Carroll, G. P.....Yes.	Vroom, G. V. P.....Yes.
Screven, 2 G. V. P.....—	Montgomery, G. S.....Yes.
Harris, A. G. S.....Yes.	Cadwalader, G. T.....Yes.
Cadle, A. G. T.....No.	Whipple, G. C.....—
Abbot, G. R.....Yes.	Hunt, G. H.....No.
Alabama.....—	California .....Yes.
Colorado.....No.	Connecticut.....—
District of Columbia.....No.	Florida..... —
Georgia .....Yes.	Illinois .....No.
Indiana. .....No.	Iowa.....No.
Kentucky.....No.	Maryland.....Yes.
Massachusetts .....Yes.	Michigan.....No.
Minnesota .....No.	Missouri.....No.
Montana..... .....No.	New Hampshire.....No.
New Jersey.....Yes.	New York.....Yes.
North Carolina.....—	North Dakota.....—
Ohio.....No.	Pennsylvania.....Yes.
Rhode Island.....—	South Carolina.....—
Tennessee.....Yes.	Texas.....No.
Virginia.....Yes.	West Virginia.....No.
Washington .....—	

THE CHAIR: Gentlemen, the report of the Secretary upon this vote is fifteen in the affirmative and sixteen in the negative. The motion therefore, is lost.

DR. RHODES (Minnesota): I now move to amend Article IX by striking out the last four words, so that it shall read: "This constitution shall take effect when ratified by a majority of the States of each national society." Striking out "voting in joint meeting."

I understand, Mr. President, that resolution is distinctly in line with what the Sons of the American Revolution have done, that they are expecting to send this back to their State societies.

MR. WOOD (Ohio): They have adopted it positively.

DR. RHODES (Minnesota): "When ratified by a majority of the State Societies of each National Society." Strike out the last four words of Article IX.

"Article IX: This constitution shall take effect when ratified by a majority of the States of each National Society."

MR. ABBOT (Massachusetts): Mr. Chairman, may I make an amendment to the amendment? I move to amend that motion by adding the words: "Only for the State so ratifying."

THE CHAIR: He is proposing an amendment to the Article himself. The question is upon the motion submitted by the gentleman from Minnesota, that the four last words of this IXth Article be left out. The article will then read: "This constitution shall take effect when ratified by a majority of the State Societies of each National Society."

DR. RHODES (Minnesota): After the word "State" put in the word "Society."

MR. JONES (Pennsylvania): I feel that we are not authorized to commit the Pennsylvania Society upon that motion, and therefore we will have to decline to vote.

DR. RHODES (Minnesota): The resolution was offered upon the suggestion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I thought would probably meet their objections.

The call of the roll resulted as follows:

RHODES' AMENDMENT STRIKING OUT LAST FOUR WORDS OF ARTICLE NINE, ETC.

Carroll, G. P.....No.	Vroom, G. V. P.....D.
Screven, 2 G. V. P.....—	Montgomery, G. S.....No.
Harris, A. G. S.....D.	Cadwalader, G. T.....D.
Cadle, A. G. T.....Yes.	Whipple, G. C.....—
Abbot, G. R.....No.	Hunt, G. H.....Yes.

Alabama.....—	California.....No.
Colorado.....Yes.	Connecticut.....—
District of Columbia...Yes.	Florida.....—
Georgia.....No.	Illinois.....Yes.
Indiana.....Yes.	Iowa.....Yes.
Kentucky.....Yes.	Maryland.....D.
Massachusetts.....Yes.	Michigan.....Yes.
Minnesota.....Yes.	Missouri.....Yes.
Montana.....Yes.	New Hampshire.....Yes.
New Jersey.....D.	New York.....Yes.
North Carolina.....—	North Dakota.....—
Ohio.....Yes.	Pennsylvania.....D.
Rhode Island.....—	South Carolina.....—
Tennessee.....D.	Texas.....Yes.
Virginia.....D.	West Virginia.....Yes.
Washington.....—	

[*Note.*—"D." signifies Declined to vote.]

During the call of the roll the following officers and delegates, as their names or States were called, said:

MR. VROOM (General Vice-President): Mr. President, I must decline to vote, on the ground that I maintain that it would be unconstitutional. That a majority of the States have no more right to amend the constitution than this body sitting here to-day have a right to amend this constitution. As a member of the General Society I cannot vote for what I consider illegal.

Mr. Stevens (New Jersey): The delegates from New Jersey decline to vote on the ground that they have no authority to bind their Society by such action.

Mr. Lewis (New York): New York votes aye in the belief that the amendment is an improvement by doing away with the most offensive violation of the constitution. It is here to reserve for the decision of the State itself the question of the binding effect upon the State Society.

Mr. Jones (Pennsylvania): Pennsylvania declines to vote, on the ground that it has no authority to bind its State Society.

The Chair: On this question the decision of the Assembly is ayes 18, noes 5, decline to vote 8, therefore the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota is adopted.

Mr. Wood (Ohio): Mr. Chairman, I now move the adoption of the plan and constitution as reported by the Committee.

Motion seconded.

Mr. Wood (Ohio): And I then desire to move afterwards that a Committee be appointed to notify the Sons of the American Revolution of the action of this body.

My motion is first the adoption of the constitution as amended by this body.

The call of the roll on the adoption of the plan of union and constitution proposed in the report of the majority of the Conference Committee as amended showed the following result:

Wood's Motion for Adoption of Constitution as Amended.

Carroll, G. P.....No.	Vroom, G. V. P.....No.
Screven, 2 G. V. P.....—	Montgomery, G. S.....No.
Harris, A. G. S.....No.	Cadwalader, G. T.....No.
Cadle, A. G. T.....Yes.	Whipple, G. C.....—
Abbot, G. R.....No.	Hunt, G. H.....Yes.

Alabama.....—	California.....No.
Colorado.....Yes.	Connecticut.....—
District of Columbia...Yes.	Florida.....—
Georgia.....No.	Illinois.....Yes.
Indiana.....Yes.	Iowa.....Yes.
Kentucky.....Yes.	Maryland.....Tie.
Massachusetts.....Tie.	Michigan.....Yes.
Minnesota.....Yes.	Missouri.....Yes.
Montana.....Yes.	New Hampshire.....Yes.
New Jersey.....No.	New York.....No.
North Carolina.....—	North Dakota.....—
Ohio.....Yes.	Pennsylvania.....D.
Rhode Island.....—	South Carolina.....—
Tennessee.....D.	Texas.....Yes.
Virginia.....D.	West Virginia.....Yes.
Washington.....—	

[*Note.*—"D." signifies Declined to vote.]

Mr. Wilson: The Maryland delegation being divided, part of it declining to vote, and the other part desiring to vote "no," announce a tie.

Mr. Abbot: Massachusetts announces a tie, part of the delegation desiring to vote "aye" and part "no."

The Chair: The vote as recorded here for this proposition is sixteen ayes, ten noes, three declinations to vote, and two ties. The motion, therefore, is adopted.

Mr. Cooke (Colorado): I move you, sir, that a committee of five be appointed by the Chair to notify the Sons of the American Revolution of our action here to-day.

Motion seconded.

The Chair: The Chair appoints the following Committee:

Dr. Rhodes (Minnesota): Before the motion is put I would like to amend it by providing that the President-General be the Chairman of that Committee.

This motion was put by Dr. Rhodes and carried.

THE CHAIR: The Chair would appoint as a Committee—

MR. MOULTON (Illinois): The only motion I understand is that the President-General be the Chairman of that Committee, which was put by Dr. Rhodes and carried.

THE CHAIR: Now it is moved that a Committee of five be appointed by the Chair.

MR. MOULTON (Illinois): Allow me to offer a substitute for the motion in the form of an amendment. I am perfectly willing and very desirous that the President shall represent this Society if the motion is adopted, but I do believe that there are other matters that should be taken up at the time of notifying the other National Society of the action, and therefore I have drafted a resolution containing that idea and some other ideas. I am perfectly willing to include the President-General of the order.

I offer this as a substitute for the motion of the gentlemen from Colorado and Minnesota:

"*Resolved:* That a Committee of five, of which the President-General shall be the Chairman, shall be appointed to communicate the action of this General Society to the National Society Sons of the American Revolution which has been taken upon the question of the union of the two Societies and upon the adoption of the new constitution; and that said Committee be empowered to request similar action on the part of the National Society Sons of the American Revolution; and further to agree and report upon a time and place for a joint meeting of the two Societies for the purpose of fully perfecting the proposed union of the two Societies, in the event that a majority of the State Societies approve of the action of their respective General Societies."

MR. PUGH (Ohio): I would suggest that our President-General be allowed to appoint the Committee without any restriction. His position during the debate has been such that I think it would be just as well to leave that resolution as it was. It is an act of courtesy which is due him for his courtesy to us.

THE CHAIR: That entirely corresponds with the feelings of the Chair.

Mr. Wood (Ohio): May I say one word in amendment?

Mr. Moulton (Illinois): I have not occupied the floor to-day until this time, and I wish to say now that I believe myself to be perfectly in order in offering this resolution as a substitute for the original motion, in the nature of an amendment, whether the original mover seconds it or not. I offer this resolution to the General Society, and ask for a vote on it.

The Chair: The Chair must state to this meeting that the Chair would not be a party to making any offer of a future joint meeting, that he does not consider it within his power to act in that way; therefore I would decline any part in that part of the programme.

Mr. Moulton (Illinois): Allow me one moment, so as to get the matter perfectly clear before the Society. I understand the desire of the President-General not to be personally upon that Committee. I therefore move the resolution as I originally made it, that a Committee of five be appointed by the Chair.

Mr. Cooke (Colorado): I made a motion to appoint a committee of five, and the gentleman from Minnesota suggested that you be on it, and I accepted that amendment, and it was put to vote and carried—that a committee of five be appointed, of which the President-General was to be Chairman.

The Chair: That question is before the house now.

Mr. Moulton (Illinois): I move this as a substitute for that motion:

"*Resolved:* That a committee of five shall be appointed to communicate the action of this General Society to the National Society Sons of the American Revolution which has been taken upon the question of the union of the two societies and upon the adoption of the new constitution; and that said committee be empowered to request similar action on the part of the National Society Sons of the American Revolution; and further to agree and report upon a time and place for a joint meeting of the two societies for the purpose of fully perfecting the proposed union of the two societies, in

the event that a majority of the State Societies approve of the action of their respective General Societies."

My reason for adding this to the other resolution for the appointment of a committee is this. I have known, and I presume it is well known to the majority here, that the Sons of the American Revolution did not take action similar to ours. This is in the nature of a Committee of Conference to endeavor to get them to make their action harmonious with ours and designate a time and place where the whole thing can be approved.

THE CHAIR: The question is on the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Illinois.

MR. MOULTON'S Amendment seconded, put to vote and carried.

THE CHAIR: The question, therefore, now recurs on the motion as amended, that the Chair appoint a committee of five to communicate to the gentlemen of the Sons of the American Revolution our action here today, and to request them to concur in our action or to take similar proceedings.

Put to vote and carried.

THE CHAIR: I will appoint on the Committee,
Mr. Achilles Henry Pugh, Ohio,
Mr. Rukard Hurd, Minnesota,
Mr. Gaillard Hunt, District of Columbia,
Mr. Persifor Marsden Cooke, Colorado, and
Mr. Ephraim Morgan Wood, Ohio.

MR. WOOD (Ohio): I take it that we have about concluded our deliberations and the business for which we have been assembled. I have taken a somewhat prominent and active part in the discussion to-day, and I occupied a somewhat similar position in Philadelphia, and I don't think—Gentlemen may I have your attention, because I desire to make a motion which I know you all will vote for—I do not think, except for the word said by the presiding officer when requested to act as Chairman that any one would have known except by his vote which side he favored in the discussion. I have never seen, sir—and I say it without flattery, but

as a simple statement of fact—a more impartial presiding officer in a heated debate than our honored President-General to-day.

I desire to say for those with whom he honestly differs and has differed to-day, that they could not have asked from their own side a more courteous Chairman. It is therefore with great pleasure that I offer the resolution, "That the thanks of this Convention be tendered to President-General Carroll for the very impartial and courteous manner in which he has presided over the deliberations of this assembly."

Put to the vote by Mr. Wood and carried unanimously.

THE CHAIR: Gentlemen, I take the opportunity to return my sincere thanks to you for your cordial resolution which you have just adopted.

MR. ————————: I move you, sir, that a vote of thanks be extended to the Ohio Commandery of the Loyal Legion for the use of their quarters here to-day.

Seconded, put to vote, and carried.

MR. BEALE (District of Columbia): I offer the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, that the Committee for the Revision of the Rolls, appointed under the resolution adopted on April 19th, 1897, be and it is hereby continued in office, and is authorized and directed to at once proceed in conjunction with the Committee appointed for that purpose by the Sons of the American Revolution to examine, in accordance with the provision of the constitution, as amended, reported by the Joint Conference Committee, the rolls of the members of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution and the General Society of the Sons of the Revolution, for the purpose of ascertaining whether any member in either Society is not in fact entitled to membership therein, and that upon the report of the Joint Committee thus formed all members who are not found to have been entitled to membership in their respective National Societies under their constitutions and by-laws, be held not to be entitled to membership in the Society of the American Revolution, and be stricken from its rolls, unless

within a reasonable time, to be fixed by said Committee, such members shall prove their right to such membership."

Motion seconded.

Mr. Stevens (New Jersey): As I understand the resolution, it is subject to the consent of the majority That says that every member now in good standing in either one of the Societies shall be included as a member.

Mr. Pugh (Ohio): Subject to the examination of the Revision Committee.

Mr. Beale (District of Columbia): I will say the amendment to it is represented by the words "Subject, however, to the approval of the Joint Committee on Revision of the Membership rolls."

The Chair: The Convention will be in order. The question is on the motion submitted by Mr. Beale.

Mr. Beale on request read resolution again:

"*Resolved*, That the Committee for the Revision of the Rolls, appointed under the resolution adopted on April 19th, 1897, be and is hereby continued in office, and is authorized and directed to at once proceed in conjunction with the Committee appointed for that purpose by the Sons of the American Revolution to examine, in accordance with the provision of the constitution, as amended, reported by the Joint Conference Committee, the rolls of the members of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution and the General Society of the Sons of the Revolution, for the purpose of ascertaining whether any member in either Society is not in fact entitled to membership therein, and that upon the report of the Joint Committee thus formed all members who are not found to have been entitled to membership in their respective National Societies under their constitutions and by-laws, be held not to be entitled to membership in the Society of the American Revolution, and be stricken from its rolls, unless within a reasonable time, to be fixed by said Committee, such members shall prove their right to such membership."

Seconded, submitted to vote, and carried.

Mr. Beale (District of Columbia): I now offer the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, that each State Society of the Sons of the Revolution and the Sons of the American Revolution shall submit the papers of their respective societies to the Registrar of the other society for examination; that after such examination shall be had, each Registrar shall certify to the eligibility of each member of the other society under the national constitution of the society of which he is a member. In case any doubt shall arise as to the correctness of any paper, then such doubtful paper shall be submitted to the Joint Committee on Revision of Membership Rolls. In case there is any jurisdiction in which there is only one society, such paper shall also be submitted to said Joint Committee on Revision of Membership Rolls."

The idea being this, that in every jurisdiction where there are two societies, the Sons of the Revolution and the Sons of the American Revolution shall exchange their papers. The severest critic that could possibly be would be the Registrar of the opposing society. Ninety-nine per cent. of our papers, so far as the Sons of the Revolution is concerned, we believe to be correct. When any question of doubt arises as to any paper, that paper is to be submitted to the Joint Committee on Revision of Membership Rolls, and in any jurisdiction in which there is only one society "such papers shall also be submitted to said Joint Committee on Revision of Membership Rolls," the idea being simply this, to put the papers in the hands of the jurisdiction which is familiar with the personnel of the men whose papers are to be examined, and take off of the shoulders of the Committee on Membership Rolls such detail work in order to lessen their labors.

Seconded, put to vote and carried.

Mr. Lyon (Illinois): I move that the minutes of this special meeting be printed at length and an official copy be sent to the General Secretary of each of the State Societies.

Seconded, put to vote and carried.

Mr. Voorhees (Colorado): I desire to ask the consideration of the following resolution at this time, and will not make any remarks thereon:

"Whereas, The Continental Congress, on the 14th day of June, 1777, passed the following:

"'*Resolved:* That the flag of the thirteen States be thirteen stripes, alternate red and white; that the Union be thirteen stars, white, in a blue field, representing a new constellation,' and

"Whereas, one of the leading purposes for which the Society was formed, is 'to inspire the members with the patriotic spirit of their forefathers,' and

"Whereas, it is the sentiment of this Society, that every effort should be made to cultivate the spirit of patriotism among the people,

"Now, therefore, be it resolved, That such inspiration can best be imparted by teaching the youth of the country to respect, honor and love the flag of our Union, and, that, in furtherance of such teaching, the General Society does hereby recommend to each State Society that June 14th, 'Flag Day,' be observed by a general and public celebration under the auspices of the Society of the Sons of the Revolution."

Seconded, put to vote and carried.

Mr. Pugh (Ohio): Mr. President, and gentlemen of the Convention, it is my pleasure to inform you that we met with the Convention of the Sons of the American Revolution, in Congress assembled and presented the report of the Committee of Conference as amended at this meeting, together with such resolutions as were passed by the Society pertaining to the carrying out of these resolutions. We were received with the utmost courtesy and attention by those gentlemen, and thank them for the same. I think if we wait that in the course of a minute or two a Committee that they will appoint will reply to our communications.

Mr. Wood (Ohio): We have informal information that all the amendments were passed at once.

Mr. Cooke (Colorado): Mr. President, I desire to announce a Committee of the Sons of the American Revolution.

Mr. Gallaudet (Sons of the American Revolution): Mr. President-General and Gentlemen of the Society of the Sons of the Revolution, a Committee of five has been appointed to wait upon your Society and respond to the message which we have just received from you announcing your approval of the proposed constitution of the Society of the American Revolution, with certain amendments suggested to that constitution, and certain resolutions providing for the revision of rolls, providing the cases in which those rolls shall be revised, and also a resolution appointing a committee by name in connection with a similar committee of the Sons of the American Revolution, to provide, in a certain contingency, for the organization of the Society of the American Revolution under the constitution, which has been under consideration to-day.

We understand, Mr. President, that the action which has been taken in this Society will work in this way—I speak of it that there may be no misunderstanding—that when the constitution, which has now been agreed to by both Societies, your amendments having been adopted without change by the Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, that when this constitution shall have been approved by a majority of the State Societies of each of the two organizations, the General and National organizations, that the adoption of that constitution and the creation of a new society will have been effected. That after that conclusion shall have been reached, when it is reached, by the votes of a majority of the State Societies and of each Society, that then it will be the duty of the Committee which you have appointed, which reported to us a short time ago, and our Committee which is now here, which we have appointed to meet your Committee, to arrange for the time and place of the meeting under the constitution of the Society of the American Revolution for the organization of that Society. That is to say, the organization of that Society as the united Society of our two Societies. I would like to ask if I have made any mistake so far. I ask the officers of the Sons of the Revolution.

The Chair: That is as I understand it.

Mr. Gallaudet (Sons of the American Revolution): Then I have the great pleasure of informing you, gentlemen of the Sons

of the Revolution, that our Society did adopt, without question, and with an overwhelming vote, the action which you sent up to us by your Committee, and, as I understand it, we stand, tentatively at least, united; and my hope is that united we may continue to stand, for my belief has long been that men organized as we are, with our two great Societies divided, must, ultimately at least, deserve to fall.

(The Committee from the Society of Sons of the American Revolution retires.)

Mr. Sayres (Pennsylvania): I move that the thanks of this Society be tendered to the Ohio Society of the Sons of the Revolution.

Seconded, put to vote and carried.

On motion duly seconded the meeting adjourned.

JAN 8 1906

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 011 712 622 5